

New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of F. M. Burden, of Seneca Falls; F. P. Gildersleeve, of Union Springs; H. E. Woodward, of Ensenore; and sundry voters of Middlesex, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petitions of 38 members of the Christian Endeavor Society of Aurora; 63 citizens of Hebron; 22 citizens of Fairbury; 11 boys and girls of Blue Springs; 60 citizens of Shelby; sundry citizens of David City; the Nebraska State Sunday School Association; sundry citizens of Clear Creek; the Camp of Gideons at Lincoln; the Methodist Episcopal Church at Fairmont; the Methodist Episcopal Church at Surprise; the Methodist Episcopal Church at Tobias; various churches of Liberty; J. S. Dick, of Crete; the Evangelical Church Convention at York; a mass meeting of citizens to Giltner; the Christian Endeavor Societies of Fairbury; various members of the Christian Church at Fairbury; a mass meeting of citizens of Geneva; and the Epworth League Convention at Fairmont, all in the State of Nebraska, in favor of national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

Also protests from 17 citizens of Morse Bluff, 11 citizens of Fairbury, 31 citizens of Grafton, 21 citizens of Tobias, resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge Order of Hermanns of Nebraska, a letter from Aug. Aleck, of Western, and a letter from A. B. Korn, of Shickley, all in the State of Nebraska, against national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 17226, granting a pension to Sarah Friedline; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Leon Friedman, of Hailey, Idaho, against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial of Stephen Jackson Post, No. 191, Department of California and Nevada of the Grand Army of the Republic, relative to appropriation for reunion of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of water-power legislation at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1914.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that a way has been opened for our approach into Thy presence; that we can talk with Thee as a friend talketh face to face with a friend; and that we can come boldly to the throne of grace and make our requests known unto Thee. Surely our hope is in Thee. Our strength cometh from Thee. Amid the difficulties of the way we seek Thy hand. If we meet perplexing problems, may the light of Thy truth give us understanding. If doubts becloud our sky, may we see new visions of Thy law. And may our steps this day be ordered by the Lord. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I send to the desk three short articles on three of the bills that are now pending before the Senate, and I ask that they be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York American, July 20.]
ONE SERIOUS PERIL IN THE RAYBURN BILL.

The Rayburn bill, as rewritten by Mr. Brandeis, and now being considered by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, affords an immediate illustration of the irresistible tendency of seemingly conservative railroad legislation toward Government ownership.

This bill has for its purpose the supervision by the Interstate Commerce Commission of all future issues of securities—stocks, bonds, debentures, etc.—by railroads. The commission will be vested with the power to prohibit the issuance of any block of such securities unless, upon examination, it concludes that real need existed for borrowing the money, and that the volume of securities issued was not unduly great.

So far, so good. Wildcat methods of railroad finance, overcapitalization, buying a feeder at a price and bonding it for double the price paid, consolidations like the one planned between the New York Central and the Lake Shore, with the resultant increase of capital by some hundred millions or more, all join to make the need of some such legislation evident.

But with the new issues once authorized, the railroads will at once claim that the Government is morally bound to see that no regulative legislation shall prevent the earning of money sufficient to make interest payments.

To-day the roads base their demand for an increase in freight rates largely upon the plea that the demands made upon them by Government regulation necessitate increased earnings.

If they shall be permitted, under national authorities, to turn their great volume of ill-digested securities, hundreds of millions of which stand for mere water, into new bonds, they will instantly demand that the Government stand responsible for these bonds.

If under private ownership the roads are unable to meet these fixed charges their manager will turn them over to the Government. At what price? Obviously at the value for which the Government has authorized them to issue bonds and stock. It is therefore the business of Congress, which still has the Rayburn bill in hand, to see to it that the Government supervision over the volume of securities shall not end by making the Government take over the railroads at an exaggerated and extortionate figure.

[From the New York Tribune, Monday, July 20, 1914.]

THE SENATE LOSING INTEREST IN THE DENATURED ANTITRUST BILLS.

It is just about a month since Mr. Wilson told the Virginia Editorial Association that the administration's program of antitrust legislation was "complete" and predicted its speedy enactment. But enactment still lingers. Although the House bills, which constituted the finished Wilson program, have been torn to pieces and patched together again, the Senate is still reluctant to pass them. They have been greatly improved by the elimination of crudities all along the line. But even so, the Democratic leaders in the Senate can get up very little enthusiasm over them.

These leaders realize that a vast amount of useless labor has gone into an effort to do something which really doesn't need to be done. The administration started out with the idea that it was necessary to supplement and invigorate the Sherman antitrust law. Mr. Clayton and the other House antitrust dentists tried to put a lot of fine new teeth into the Sherman Act. But at practically every point at which the present provisions against monopoly or conspiracy to restrain trade were sought to be supplemental the experiment broke down. The proposed new law did not clarify or strengthen the existing statute. It simply overloaded and confused it. The Senate committees have been busy for the last four or five weeks ripping out the Clayton-Rayburn-Covington dentistry. What they have seen of the work of those bunglers has virtually convinced them that the Sherman law doesn't need new teeth at all.

What is the advantage, for instance, of giving an interstate trade commission power to punish interstate corporations engaging in "unfair competition" when nobody knows what such a term means? If unfair methods lead to restraint of trade, they can be dealt with already under the Sherman law. If they don't lead to restraint of trade, the commission doesn't need to worry about them. Why strain and cogitate to meet a situation which it isn't necessary to meet?

It is exactly the same with the Clayton-Gompers trick amendments giving, or merely pretending to give, union labor and farmers' organizations exemption from prosecution for violations of the antitrust law. If the amendments grant union laborers and farmers no privileges which they do not already have—as the President insists is the case—what is gained by merely saying that what is the law is the law? But if it is intended to offer special class privileges to two special classes, why incur the displeasure and enmity of all other classes? The National Association of Retail Dealers, for example, is about to descend on Congress to ask why its organization shouldn't be allowed to have the same exemption as is being offered to the farmers and the Federation of Labor people. Why, indeed, shouldn't it? If they are not to be prosecuted for carrying out the legitimate objects of their association—whatever those objects may be—the organized retailers ought not to be prosecuted for clashing to a similar extent with the Sherman law.

The antitrust bills in the original form in which Mr. Wilson approved them were destructive and vicious. In the form which the Senate committees are giving them they are far less dangerous. But, on the other hand, they are degenerating more and more into mere surplussage. No public advantage will result from passing them. It is the realization of this fact that makes them drag so woefully in the Senate. Nobody there is able to get excited over measures whose only thunder is in the title page.

[From the New York Times, Monday, July 20, 1914.]

THE TRUST DEBATES.

While Congress is working overtime upon the trinity of antitrust bills there is proceeding in the country a second debate of another sort, of which an excellent example is afforded by the address of Lincoln Cromwell to the knit-goods jobbers, reported in Saturday's Times. He speaks for substantial middle-class business, neither the biggest nor the smallest. It does not occur to the business men whom he represents to oppose the legislation which is being thrust upon them. Their aim now is "to keep it along lines which are helpful to honest merchants rather than to theorists and politicians, with their fads and demagoguery." Especially apropos is Mr. Cromwell's reference to the completeness with which the Federal courts are doing under the old law what Congress is bustling about as though there were no law to accomplish what it wants. In the decree against the Thread Trust as a combination in unreasonable restraint of trade no less than 15 practices are specifically forbidden. Blacklists, rebates, buying out competitors, fixing of resale prices, giving of bonuses, pooling of orders to get special discounts, "fighting brands," flying squadrons of salesmen to undersell competition in restricted areas, the limitation of traders from trading with others than the trust, misrepresentation of competitors' goods, threats of prosecution without intention to prosecute, selling below cost, differences of freight being considered, "free goods"—these are among unreasonable restraints of trade forbidden without the help of the new laws. It is not suggested that these are all the unreasonable restraints there are. They are merely the restraints forbidden in a single case. The power to forbid these extends to the power to forbid any other restraints contrary to commercial morality. The interesting thing about the list is that it includes so many obnoxious practices which it is designed to forbid as "unfair competition." It makes no difference whether they are forbidden as unreasonable restraints or as unfair competition, so long as they are forbidden; but it is not desirable unnecessarily to introduce a new phrase which can not be completely defined for as long a time as it has required to learn what the earlier phrase means.

Another interesting symposium to contrast with the debates in Congress is the referendum upon the Clayton bill by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The votes were taken of 559 organizations in

36 States. Nine of the ten proposals which were voted upon were rejected by majorities ranging from 6 to 1 to 20 to 1. The adverse vote is stronger than this, for many organizations declined to vote at all, on the ground that there is no demand for legislation of this sort at this time. The following votes may be given as examples:

1. The committee recommends that there should be no attempt by statute to forbid discrimination in prices of commodities; 531 in favor, 22 opposed.

2. The committee recommends that a proposal to compel persons controlling the products of mines to sell to all applicants "who may be responsible" is wrong in principle and unworkable in practice; 527 in favor, 32 opposed.

3. The committee recommends that there should not be a statutory prohibition of conditions accompanying sales and leases to the effect that buyers or lessees can not handle or use the products of competitors; 514 in favor, 35 opposed.

4. The committee recommends that the final decree in an equity suit brought by the Government which establishes the existence or the non-existence of a restraint of trade or of a monopoly should be conclusive evidence as to the same general fact in private actions brought against the same defendants under the antitrust laws; 484 in favor, 62 opposed.

Space fails to give the rest of the proposals of the Clayton bill so overwhelmingly favored by Congress and so overwhelmingly opposed in the debates among those to whom the law is to apply. May it not be that the popularity of the trinity of antitrust laws is so great among the classes of lawmakers which Mr. Cromwell describes because they will not have to obey the law, business being out of their line? If business men were legislating, would they enact the laws which they condemn when proposed by nonbusiness lawmakers? Finally, what remains of the antitrust legislation which is pending if there is deducted from it what the courts are now preventing and punishing without the assistance of the new laws, and what the representative business men of the country vote against with almost unanimity, and yet accept with the excellent temper shown by Mr. Cromwell on behalf of those for whom he speaks?

The President continues to consult business men with commendable openmindedness. He is not finding them rebellious, and can count upon their cooperation in just that degree to which he defers to their sentiments. Yet in all the reports of the consultations at the White House there is no such cordiality as in the echoes of the President's remarks to the effect that big business is as patriotic and moral as any other sort of business. The Chicago business men who went to advise the President regarding his antitrust proposals said of these remarks, "No more hopeful, helpful, finer words have ever come from the White House, and we believe that they will meet with the Nation's hearty approval." If either Congress or the President has elicited any such cordial expressions regarding the antitrust bills they have not been published. It is idle to contend that business wants the new trust bills. On the other hand, business will accommodate itself to them with resignation, and, as Mr. Cromwell says, will guide them into the right direction after they leave Congress.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Culberson	Norris	Sterling
Borah	Cummins	Overman	Stone
Brady	Gallinger	Page	Swanson
Brandegee	Hughes	Perkins	Thomas
Bristow	James	Pittman	Thompson
Bryan	Jones	Polindexter	Thornton
Burton	Kenyon	Pomerene	Tillman
Camden	Kern	Ransdell	Walsh
Catron	Lane	Shafer	West
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	White
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Works
Clapp	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Clarke, Ark.	Nelson	Smoot	

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on account of illness.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I wish also to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], who has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I wish also to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. He is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

IMPROVEMENT OF TRINITY RIVER, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] published in the Record a purported interview with one M. J. Wirth, an interview in the Washington Post, in which that gentleman ridiculed the Trinity River. I wired to Texas to find out something about M. J. Wirth, and I send the reply to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the telegram.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

DALLAS, TEX., July 20.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Yours date. No such person as M. J. Wirth known in Fort Worth by chamber of commerce or other organizations, nor is his name listed telephone or city directory. Statement that Trinity River is sought by interurban absurd on face. Distance by river between Dallas and Fort Worth approximately 50 miles, as against 30 miles air line over prairie country. Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce adopted resolution listed below March 19, 1914, approving improvement of Trinity. Steamboat has been purchased for navigation of the Trinity, and is now en route to Dallas under own steam to enter the trade. Water in Trinity at normal stage, and there is no truth whatever in statement of Wirth. Have been unable to locate him here or in Fort Worth or to find one who knows such a person. Dallas citizens have spent \$2,000,000 of their own money in sites for locks and dams and bond issues for raising bridges and diverting sewage, and are considering spending twice as much more to supplement Government work. The canalization of the Trinity will mean a saving of \$9,000 a day in Dallas freight bills. Dallas is not a seaport, but it is a port of entry with a present volume of business through its port many times greater than that of cities three times her size. This is in no sense a political project. The Trinity movement is a commercial proposition, and Dallas is supporting it for the reduction it will bring in freight rates, which will benefit the whole State. There is no pork barrel or politics in it, and this is well known to every bona fide citizen of Texas who is at all informed.

Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has designated the Trinity River for improvement; and

Whereas the improvement of this river for navigation will bring water rates into Fort Worth trade territory; and

Whereas Fort Worth is vitally interested in the prosperity and development of all of the counties in Texas through which the Trinity River runs; and

Whereas we have, as business men of Fort Worth, in years past commended the action of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and that of the Federal Government in this work in making the Trinity River navigable; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call attention of the Texas Senators and Congressmen to the fact that the interests of Fort Worth can be vastly developed by the completion of the work on the Trinity River; that we favor an increase in the present appropriation in sufficient amount so that this work can go forward promptly. We believe that no other development can so effectually tend to solve the transportation problems in Texas, and we urge immediate action on the part of all Representatives in Congress to secure prompt and favorable appropriation for this purpose.

JOHN W. PHILP,
Chairman Trinity River Committee,
Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Texas if the object of this appropriation for the improvement of the river is to reduce freight rates, which reduction the people of Fort Worth and Dallas will enjoy after the improvement is made?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is partly the object.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is an appropriation, then, to secure a reduction of the freight rates which the people of that immediate vicinity now have to pay.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is partly the object.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Senator think that an appropriation of public money for the purpose of reducing freight rates in some particular locality is a proper expenditure of public money?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, I said that was partly the object. It will not only reduce freight rates for that locality but for an entire section. It may even have a favorable effect on Kansas.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a Texas subsidy; that is all.

Mr. BRISTOW. Is it the purpose of the Senator to have toll gates established on this river and charge tolls for the use of it?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The question of subsidy does not enter into the question of improvement at all.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator is not in favor of establishing toll gates on this river?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not, because the improvement will be a general benefit to which the entire country is entitled.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should the people of the United States be taxed in order that freight rates for Fort Worth and Dallas may be reduced?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state to the Senator it is not only the people at Fort Worth and Dallas who will be benefited but a tremendous section of country, thus making the project national in its character. I would not favor a project if it were to reduce freight rates merely in one small locality.

Mr. BRISTOW. It will probably benefit the States of Kentucky and Virginia and New Hampshire somewhat?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator is so absurd now that his statement does not deserve any attempt at reply.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator said it was a national improvement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I intended to say it would affect such a large scope of territory that it was almost national in character.

Mr. BRISTOW. How much does the Senator expect this improvement to cost the Federal Government?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The estimate of the engineers is \$3,000,000. Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Senator think that the benefits will be more national than those of the Panama Canal?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have not compared the two. I have not entered into any study as to which will be of more benefit to the country.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does the Senator think that possibly Trinity River will be as important a waterway for national expenditure as the Panama Canal?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Trinity River will be used by other people besides monopolists.

Mr. BRISTOW. What other people will use it? How many steamboats have navigated the Trinity River in the last year?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order having been called for, the presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask one question which arises, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me.

The statement was made in the telegram read at the desk that \$2,000,000 had been expended by the citizens of Dallas for securing sites for locks and dams and for the construction of sewers. I think we should have an itemized statement of those expenses. Was this amount of \$2,000,000 expended for the most part in providing for a sewerage system and municipal improvements?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I insist on the regular order. We will get up the river and harbor bill in a few minutes.

Mr. BURTON. I think in connection with the canalization of the river—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Permit me to say—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall furnish the itemized statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is without remedy. The Senator from Georgia has called for the regular order, and the presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 785. An act to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

S. 1087. An act authorizing the exchange of certain lands within the Fishlake National Forest, Utah;

S. 5316. An act authorizing the survey and sale of certain lands in Coconino County, Ariz., to the occupants thereof; and

S. 5462. An act to authorize the county of Barry, State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the White River in Barry County, Mo., at or near a point known as Goldens Ferry.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 485) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1784) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5957) to authorize the Frost-Johnson Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the Sabine River in the States of Louisiana and Texas, about 2 miles west of Hunter, La., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4545. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

H. R. 13311. An act to cede a certain parcel of land to the county of Fulton, State of Georgia;

H. R. 15110. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept conveyance of title to certain land between the post-office site and Madison Street in the city of Thomasville, Ga.;

H. R. 16476. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Susanville, in Lassen County, Cal., for certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16579. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. John River at Fort Kent, Me.; and

H. R. 17005. An act authorizing the fiscal court of Pike County, Ky., to construct a bridge across Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, at or near Williamson, W. Va.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Webster City Chautauqua, of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of the so-called antitrust legislation, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, at Urbana, Ohio, favoring an appropriation of \$200,000 to aid in the national celebration and so-called peace jubilee to be held at Vicksburg in 1915, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STERLING presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lebanon and White, in the State of South Dakota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Williams, Cal., praying for the enactment of the so-called anti-narcotic bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a Federal board of censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of McKinnon Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of certain soldiers and sailors of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HUGHES presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Jersey, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Center County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in prison-made goods, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Flemington, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pension to all widows of veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Haverhill, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Clayton antitrust bill, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 926) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 695) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 4492. A bill to authorize James F. Barbour and his successors in title to permanently maintain and use siding from the tracks of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad in the city of Washington (Rept. No. 696); and

H. R. 12844. An act for the relief of Spencer Roberts, a member of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 697).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 6134) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 6135) granting an increase of pension to Jean H. G. Kitchel, to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEST:

A bill (S. 6136) to increase the salaries of the United States district attorney and United States marshal and deputy marshals for the southern district of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 6137) refunding certain taxes illegally collected under the war-revenue act of June 13, 1898; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6138) for the relief of Frank Kinsey Hill, captain on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 6139) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Littrell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6140) granting a pension to Mary McJenkins (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6141) granting a pension to Charles R. Conger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 6142) granting a pension to Nancy J. Northup; to the Committee on Pensions.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. WEEKS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WATERS OF THE RIO GRANDE.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) to determine the rights of the State of Colorado and of its citizens in the beneficial uses of waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries within the boundaries of Colorado, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

ELIZABETH P. DUFEE.

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 428), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Elizabeth P. Dufee, widow of Benjamin Dufee, late messenger, United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral and all other expenses.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. WORKS. I have an article on the subject of the International Institute of Agriculture by David Lubin, delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, 1914. I desire to have the article printed as a Senate document, and for that purpose I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PUBLIC BUILDING SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 551).

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to ask that the communication I send to the desk may be printed as a Senate document. It is an estimate submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury for appropriations for the acquisition of sites and the erection of post-office buildings all within the limit of cost. The communication was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, but was not printed. Senators interested in it are anxious to have it printed, so that they may see what is being done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday next, July 23, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall address the Senate on the subject of trusts, trust regulation, and trust legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On July 17, 1914:

S. 4714. An act to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws; and

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a member of the New Jersey and New York Joint Harbor Line Commission.

LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1784) restoring to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for reservoir purposes at the headwaters of the Mississippi River and tributaries.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

SABINE RIVER BRIDGE, LOUISIANA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5957) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Sabine River in the States of Louisiana and Texas, about 2 miles west of Hunter, La., which were, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "and" and insert a comma; on page 1, line 5, after "maintain," to insert ", and operate"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Frost-Johnson Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the Sabine River in the States of Louisiana and Texas, about 2 miles west of Hunter, La."

Mr. RANDELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 16579. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. John River at Fort Kent, Me.; and

H. R. 17005. An act authorizing the fiscal court of Pike County, Ky., to construct a bridge across Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 13311. An act to cede a certain parcel of land to the county of Fulton, State of Georgia; and

H. R. 16476. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Susanville, in Lassen County, Cal., for certain lands, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4545. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 15110. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept conveyance of title to certain land between the post-office site and Madison Street, in the city of Thomasville, Ga., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HILO, HAWAII, STREET RAILWAY.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, I wish to state that

there is a House bill upon the calendar, reported by that committee, which relates to the franchise of a street railway in the island of Hilo. The franchise will expire on the 1st day of August unless the bill, which grants its extension for two years, is promptly passed. Those interested have expended \$15,000 in the enterprise. It is very urgent, as I have stated, that the bill should be passed before the 1st of August. The street railway involved runs alongside of Government property, and the railroad will be of more benefit to the Government lands than to any others. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which is House bill 8060.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at this time I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

PENSION BUREAU EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 427) submitted by Mr. Goff on yesterday, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to transmit to the Senate the following information:

First. The names, age, and length of service of all employees of the Bureau of Pensions on March 4, 1913.

Second. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States.

Third. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been promoted since said date.

Fourth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been demoted \$100 per annum since said date.

Fifth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been demoted \$200 per annum since said date.

Sixth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been demoted \$300 per annum since said date.

Seventh. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been demoted \$400 per annum since said date.

Eighth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been demoted \$500 per annum since said date.

Ninth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who are now receiving pensions.

Tenth. Total number of those so employed who served in any war of the United States who have been dismissed or whose resignations have been asked for since said date.

Eleventh. Total number of Confederate veterans employed in said bureau on the date named.

Twelfth. Total number of Confederate veterans so employed who have been promoted since said date.

Thirteenth. Total number of Confederate veterans so employed who have been demoted since said date.

Mr. GALLINGER obtained the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Ohio desire to make a statement in reference to the resolution?

Mr. POMERENE. I was going to suggest this: The junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], who offered the resolution, is not in the Chamber, and perhaps action on it ought to be deferred on that account. I have an amendment which I intend to offer. I will send it to the desk, and ask that both the original resolution and the amendment lie over until the Senator from West Virginia is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to state that the Senator from West Virginia has been called to his home on account of illness in his family, and I have been requested to ask that the resolution might lie on the table, subject to his call, until his return.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I wish also to offer this suggestion: I think that later on both the resolution and the amendment should be referred to a committee for their consideration and report, but I do not ask that to be done at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution and the proposed amendment lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution, which I ask may take the course suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution, together with the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from West Virginia, will lie on the table and be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the river and harbor bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KENYON. I object.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the river and harbor bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13811, commonly known as the river and harbor bill.

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is necessarily absent. I believe, under the terms of the pair, I am entitled to vote, but I shall wait and see if I can obtain a transfer. If not, I shall withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIPLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], but it has been agreed by us that the pairs shall be so modified as to apply only to the trust and trades measures now before the open Senate, and to some other matters. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to my colleague [Mr. SMITH] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN], and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I wish this announcement to stand on subsequent roll calls for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. May I inquire if the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIPLEY] is necessarily absent. He is paired as has been stated. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce the following pairs.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLING] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

I will not repeat this announcement, but will ask that it may stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—37.

Bankhead	James	Martine, N. J.	Polindexter
Bryan	Jones	Nelson	Pomerene
Camden	Kern	Overman	Ransdell
Chamberlain	Lane	Page	Saulsbury
Clarke, Ark.	Lee, Md.	Perkins	Shafroth
Hughes	Martin, Va.	Pittman	Sheppard

Simmons
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Mich.
Sterling

Stone
Swanson
Thompson
Thornton

Tillman
Vardaman
West
White

Works

NAYS—15.

Ashurst
Borah
Brandegee
Bristow

Catron
Clapp
Clark, Wyo.
Cummins

Gallinger
Gronna
Kenyon
Myers

Norris
Smoot
Weeks

NOT VOTING—44.

Brady
Burleigh
Burton
Chilton
Colt
Crawford
Culberson
Dillingham
du Pont
Fall
Fletcher

Goff
Gore
Hitchcock
Hollis
Johnson
La Follette
Lea, Tenn.
Lewis
Lippitt
Lodge
McCumber

McLean
Newlands
O'Gorman
Oliver
Owen
Penrose
Reed
Robinson
Root
Sherman
Shields

Shively
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.
Stephenson
Sutherland
Thomas
Townsend
Walsh
Warren
Williams

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in the telegram from Dallas, Tex., which has been read from the desk, the statement was made that some two million dollars had been raised by the citizens of that city, with the inference that it was for the promotion of the improvement of the Trinity River. I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of that growing community. Its citizens have shown great public spirit and have contributed somewhat liberally to the promotion of navigation in the Trinity River; but I think the telegram conveys an inference altogether incorrect. No such sum as \$2,000,000 has been contributed toward this improvement. Information as to the amount contributed in connection with the improvement is published in a public document, and I think we should ask for an itemization of that \$2,000,000. My impression is that the larger portion of it, in fact, nearly all of it, has been expended for a sewerage system and for municipal improvements which are entirely independent of any plan for the navigation of the Trinity River.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, a new sewerage system was constructed in order that the disposition of the sewage might not interfere in any way with the navigation of the river, and but for the fact that they thought that it was desirable to improve the river there would have been no necessity of expending the money to provide other means for the disposition of sewage.

Mr. BURTON. I think everyone knows that it would be utterly insanitary for a growing city of that kind to discharge its sewage through a navigable stream which for a portion of the year is practically dry; and any growing community considering the future will provide some other means for disposing of its sewage rather than to discharge it through a river that sometimes has practically no flow whatever, and that, too, in the hot seasons of the year, when prompt disposition of the sewage is indispensable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the river has been used for that purpose ever since the city was founded, and I dispute the statement that the river is ever practically dry. It may be dry sometimes in some branches above Dallas, but from Dallas down I dispute that it is ever practically dry, and I ask the Senator for his proof.

Mr. BURTON. I think the official reports will show that it is difficult, if not impossible, to carry away a great quantity of sewage, such as must be disposed of from a city of that size with the ordinary flow of that river at all seasons of the year. Of course, I have not made any specialty of the sewage of the city of Dallas, but that is an inference which I very decidedly draw from the reports upon the subject.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, do I understand that this large expenditure for sewage disposal was for the purpose of carrying the refuse away from the river, so that it would not fill it up and prevent navigation?

Mr. BURTON. I so understand the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BRISTOW. And the river is dry a part of the year?

Mr. BURTON. It may not be dry, but there is practically no water or current. The suggestion was made that the flow might be stimulated by digging artesian wells, but I believe that has never been done.

Mr. BRISTOW. Is it proposed to dig artesian wells in order that we may create navigable streams, and then dig trenches for the streams to run in, in order that our steamboats may float?

Mr. BURTON. I will not say it is exactly that. Artesian wells were recommended or favorably commented on in the first

report made on this river, the one upon which the improvement is based.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the original engineers' report made the suggestion that artesian wells might be utilized to furnish water for the stream. There is no doubt about that. They have gotten along without it. Possibly the sewage helped out a little toward furnishing water for the stream.

Mr. BRISTOW. I undertook to find out during the morning hour what navigation there was on this stream, how many steamboats had been constructed, and how many steamboats were in operation carrying commerce up and down the Trinity River. Has the Senator from Ohio any information as to that?

Mr. BURTON. No; I have not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why, Mr. President, at present the locks and dams have not reached a sufficient stage of completion to justify the navigation of the river; but several locks and dams have been in course of construction during the last six or eight years and are now reaching completion, and we have a boat ready to pass up the stream as soon as the locks and dams now being built are completed.

Mr. BRISTOW. They have one boat?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The city of Dallas has purchased a boat to put on the river.

Mr. BRISTOW. Where is that boat now, please?

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand from this telegram, it is now near Galveston.

Mr. BRISTOW. How do they expect to get it there—by train or by water?

Mr. SHEPPARD. They expect to get it there by the river, I will say; and they may send for the Senator from Kansas and let his eloquence pull it up.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; my eloquence is not to be contributed to any such purpose as that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it would cause such a disturbance in the atmosphere that if you put sails on the boat it would carry it right up the river.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, if the Senator thinks they will put on sails and navigate the air in Texas, that would be a different proposition; but the boat that I understand the city of Dallas has is not an aeroplane, I think.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A sufficient disturbance of the air produces rainfall. If we can not get the water in any other way, we might get it in that way.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suppose that is about the way the Senator expects to get the boat floated up the dry ditches that he is having the Government dig there to lower the freight rates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I was simply giving an answer worthy of the charge made by the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have made no charge. I have been trying to secure information from the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am perfectly willing to give the Senator information.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, this telegram, which it has been suggested is longer than the river, states that this boat is en route to Dallas under its own steam, so the Senator must realize that there is at least one boat there that is proceeding under its own steam.

Mr. BRISTOW. I wonder where that boat is. I will inquire of the Senator from Texas if he can not send a tracer for it and locate it, so that we may have some knowledge as to where that boat is now, and how much it will cost to get it up to Dallas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will do so, for the benefit of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; I think the country ought to know something about it. These vast expenditures are being made on dry ditches in Texas for the purpose of improving the navigation of the streams and thereby lowering freight rates. We have heard a good deal in the discussion about appropriations to lower freight rates. We have heard some very eloquent speeches on that subject.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have not the floor, except by the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CHILTON. I just wanted to suggest to the Senator that probably the boat is in the river.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What river is the Senator speaking of?

Mr. BRISTOW. The Trinity River, as I understand, is the name of the ravine there that is being improved for purposes

of navigation. The Senator from West Virginia suggests that the boat is in the river, but we have not any information to that effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the further information has been vouchsafed that it can not navigate the stream until the locks and the dams are built.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why do they have it in the river? I think they ought to have it in a box car.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, all this humor is very pleasant, but I want to say that the statement that the river is dry, or practically dry, is an unspeakable slander; that it is a worthy project; and I shall endeavor to show that it is a worthy project when the time comes to discuss it. So far as the artesian-well proposition is concerned, the first engineer who made an examination did say something about artesian wells in the upper reaches of the river, the reaches at and above Dallas; but since that time a special board of engineers re-examined that section of the river and found that no artificial water supply would be necessary; that the rainfall was sufficient for navigation in the upper stretches of the river.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will ask the Senator what is the length of the river?

Mr. SHIPPARD. About 500 miles.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether it has been charged that there is no water in this river?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly it has been charged that there is no water in it. It was charged this morning; but I can demonstrate to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that all these charges are mere harmless badinage; that they are just as empty as some gentlemen claim the river is [laughter]; that the attacks they make on the river to-day are of a kind with the faked interview in the Washington Post yesterday. I think it must have been faked, because it wore all the earmarks of a fake. I refer to the interview that was published here in the RECORD yesterday purporting to come from one M. J. Wirth, of Fort Worth, Tex. Nobody in Texas seems to know anything about him.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask, in my own time, and while the Senator from Texas is on his feet, when he expects to make his remarks defending the Trinity. That subject seems to be assuming such importance and awakening such wide interest that I certainly would be willing to give way for his defense of the Trinity River and the various Texas projects. May I ask when the Senator from Texas intends to take this up?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I propose to discuss it when we reach the item in the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, we may never reach the item. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the way the Senator is speaking now, I do not suppose we will.

Mr. BURTON. That may be.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I suggest that the attack on the Trinity ought not to involve an attack on the whole plan of salvation—the salvation of Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state, for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa, that there are no red lights on the river.

Mr. KENYON. I suppose the water could not put them out if there were.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, again resuming my argument, yesterday I referred to the statistics for traffic through the Muscle Shoals Canal, with its locks, and through the Colbert and Bee Tree Shoals Canal on the Tennessee River. I should like the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris], who participated in that discussion and made some valuable suggestions. I stated that I had only the figures for the year 1912, and that possibly the figures for the later year would show a material increase. This morning I have obtained the 1913 statistics, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

COMMERCIAL STATISTICS OF MUSCLE SHOALS AND COLBERT SHOALS CANALS.

DISTRICT ENGINEER OFFICER, CHATTANOOGA DISTRICT,
July 16, 1914.

The CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C.:

In reply to telegram of the 15th instant relative to commercial statistics for the Muscle Shoals Canal and the Colbert Shoals Canal, Tennessee River, below is the statement for the calendar year 1913, these being the latest figures available:

Muscle Shoals Canal.		Tons.
Cotton	1,226	
Cotton seed	784	
Grain	16	

	Tons.
Hay	37
Other farm products	9
Logs	45
Lumber	147
Ties	10
Other timber products	3
Coal	45
Fertilizer	2,150
Flour	131
General merchandise	905
Machinery and implements	233
Miscellaneous	136

Total 5,887

Estimated value, \$580,000.

Colbert Shoals Canal.

	Tons.
Grain	158
Live stock	1
Other farm products	89
Lumber	16
Ties	30,012
Other timber products	4
Fertilizer	209
Flour	34
General merchandise	160
Machinery and implements	5
Miscellaneous	22

Total 30,710

Estimated value, \$215,000.

H. BURGESS,
Major, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to make some comments upon these figures.

The traffic through the Muscle Shoals Canal in the year 1912 amounted to 5,520 tons. For 1913 it was slightly larger—5,887 tons. The value has also somewhat increased, from \$449,857 to \$585,000—an increase, however, which is not very material.

On the other hand, in the Colbert Shoals Canal, which was first opened in the month of November, 1911, there has been a decrease from 31,943 tons in 1912 to 30,710 tons in 1913, and a decrease in the value of the freight from \$232,672 to \$215,000. The predominant item is still railroad ties—30,518 tons in 1912 and 30,012 tons in 1913. In 1912 the traffic in merchandise and all other articles besides railroad ties amounted to but 1,175 tons. This has fallen in the last year to 698 tons, a decrease of nearly one-half.

The idea I had yesterday that possibly a later year would show some increase, which would afford some vestige of justification of these improvements, has certainly been entirely disappointed. The traffic on the Muscle Shoals Canal, though slightly increasing, is still very small. The traffic on the very expensive Colbert Shoals Canal, costing \$2,313,000, and \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year for maintenance, has diminished in its second year.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator say, taking out logs and ties, that in 1913 there were only 698 tons?

Mr. BURTON. Six hundred and ninety-eight tons.

Mr. NORRIS. That would mean that the cost per ton to the Government would be higher this year than the one we were talking about yesterday?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator there the expense of maintenance?

Mr. BURTON. I have not. I should conjecture that it would be somewhat less than for the first year, which was \$34,500. The interest on the investment at 4 per cent would be \$92,000. It would be a safe conjecture that, coupled with the cost of operation, the sum of the two would be \$100,000, and probably it would be in excess of that amount; perhaps \$110,000 or \$115,000.

Mr. NORRIS. We found out yesterday that taking the maintenance cost for 1912 and adding 4 per cent interest on the investment, and then taking out of the calculation the logs and the railroad ties, it cost the Government about \$100 a ton to put this traffic through the lock.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; or the canal. The canal includes the lock.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. In that connection I wish to ask the Senator a question. This is only one lock on the river?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. There are quite a number of other locks, are there not?

Mr. BURTON. There are in the Muscle Shoals system. Part are on one side of the river, and part on the other side.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, if it costs the Government \$100 to put a ton of freight through one lock, and there are five or six locks to go through, if there was any freight there that traveled

any distance, the cost would amount to several hundred dollars per ton, would it not?

Mr. BURTON. The cost is not so great per ton of valuable freight in the Muscle Shoals Canal.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably not quite so great.

Mr. BURTON. This seems to be the maximum cost of freight passing through any lock or improvement in the Tennessee River, and perhaps it is the maximum in the United States. The total cost per ton, excluding railroad ties, for the last year—1913—would be approximately \$150 per ton; and using the very striking comparison that the Senator from Nebraska employed yesterday, the value of all traffic passing through the Colbert Shoals Canal in 1913 was \$215,000. The value by items is not given, but the quantity of railroad ties is almost exactly the same as last year, and they were valued at \$137,000. Deducting that amount from the total value of 1913 would show the traffic other than ties had a value of \$78,000. So the expense, when you count in interest on the investment and the cost of maintenance, is clearly \$20,000 more than the total value of all the freight passing through the canal, excluding the railroad ties, which could readily be floated.

Mr. NORRIS. Those are the figures for this one lock only?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. But suppose the freight had to be passed through two locks?

Mr. BURTON. I would not anticipate that the cost would increase proportionately.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the Senator another question on a subject that I asked him about yesterday. I have found from the report of the Chief of Engineers something bearing on the point, and it is directly in connection with the subject about which the Senator is talking now.

I asked the Senator yesterday whether or not the United States Government was not liable for damages to the men who were engaged in logging and getting out and shipping railroad ties. They seem to be the principal articles that are shipped down these rivers. The Senator did not think there was any possibility of damages coming on that account.

Mr. BURTON. I understood the question of the Senator from Nebraska related to the liability of the Government for damages.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, probably not a technical or legal liability, but a moral liability. I believe the records show that the Government has destroyed an occupation in which a good many men were employed, and a great deal of money invested, by putting in these locks. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read from the report of the Chief of Engineers for 1913. The report is speaking not of this particular lock, but of the same thing in connection with another river.

Mr. BURTON. The Kentucky River?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. They say as follows:

The principal commerce of the river is timber, which can be most advantageously handled as loose logs; but as the slack-water improvement has progressed it has been necessary to impose and enforce regulations preventing the running of loose logs in the portions improved, which imposes hardship on the interests involved, since it requires rafting and towing the logs. If allowed to run loose the logs and the dams would cause reciprocal damage. For the towns of Valley View and Ford, at railroad crossings of the river, and formerly sawmill and transshipping points, the results have been disastrous, since such of their industry as survived has been transferred to other points.

So it seems the building of dams has driven men out of business.

Mr. BURTON. I certainly do not see any ground of liability when the Federal Government improves a waterway and makes it more suitable for general commerce.

Mr. NORRIS. About the only commerce is railroad ties and logs.

Mr. BURTON. And that is by persons who use original methods.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say that I am not claiming that there is any legal liability, but ought we not to take into consideration before we build dams and locks in rivers where there is no navigation except for logs that we are injuring men who are engaged in the logging business?

Mr. BURTON. I have no doubt whatever that locks and dams have been constructed at very large expense in instances where the communities tributary to the river have been injured rather than helped.

The statistics for the Muscle Shoals Canal show a striking similarity for the years 1912 and 1913. Those for the Colbert Shoals Canal are not so identical.

The most unfavorable indication in the statistics for the two years for that improvement is the decline in the development of general merchandise. In the year 1912, 329 tons of general merchandise passed through that canal. That quantity diminished to 160 tons in 1913.

Think of it, Mr. President and Senators; this is an improvement which extends the navigation of a stretch of great river 206 miles long, near to two promising industrial centers—Florence and Sheffield. At one of those towns there are iron furnaces. One of them has a population of over 6,000 inhabitants. They are only a few miles from this improvement, but yet you have this unfavorable showing for the second year after this great canal is opened.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What was the cost of it?

Mr. BURTON. Two million three hundred and thirteen thousand dollars. The amount of general freight, other than railroad ties, carried through it was only 698 tons for the year 1913.

The conjecture I offered yesterday that possibly in the first year the shipping interests has not as yet begun to use it and that a larger traffic would develop is disproved by the traffic of the second year.

I do not begrudge the time consumed in presenting to the Senate the arguments and the indisputable facts on such a project when similar features appear in the pending river and harbor bill.

I know something of the history of this canal. It was authorized in the year 1890. Year after year Congress hesitated about making any appropriation. In the month of May, 1899, I saw that lock and dam, a magnificent piece of masonry, standing there alone. Egypt had no monopoly on great works of masonry the purpose of which remained a mystery. The pyramids are no finer than this lock. Of those who look upon it some praise the work and some the architects, but I think the laudation will be largely reserved to the Congressmen who obtained the original appropriation for that improvement.

It has been finished at last, and here are the results: Two million three hundred thousand dollars have been expended upon it, and if it were not for the pride in finishing what we began it had better been left unfinished, so far as any commercial results from it have been shown.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. SHIELDS. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio at what time did the worthlessness of this improvement at Colbert Shoals appear?

Mr. BURTON. You never could be sure of it until it was opened in November, 1911, and was subjected to the test.

Mr. SHIELDS. Is it not a familiar fact that \$1,500,000 of the appropriation complained of was appropriated while the Senator from Ohio was chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. BURTON. I do not think so, though I want to look that up. While I have delinquencies to answer for, I trust that is not one of them. It is true it was a work under way when I became a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and it is probable that appropriations were made for it during my service as chairman of that committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. I should like to call the Senator's attention to page 2499 of the report of the Chief of Engineers and let him see that between the period beginning March 3, 1899, and ending March 4, 1909, there was \$1,518,000 appropriated for this improvement, while the Senator was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, and of course I suppose it was done with his approval.

Mr. BURTON. Well, I suppose it was, but I do not think it will amount to that figure. I see that an appropriation was made in the sundry civil act of 1903 and in the river and harbor act of 1905. But am I to blame for that? Here was a project to which the Government had committed itself in the year 1890, on which it had expended the sum of \$695,000. A magnificent masonry structure had been erected; and it would be a very far cry, it would be an unusual exertion of the prerogative of a member of a committee or even of its chairman to say "I will stop that improvement right there."

A great many of these projects did not commend themselves to us. We had the Illinois & Mississippi Canal, which had already cost some six or seven million dollars, and required a million more for completion, and we actually hesitated about appropriating that additional million. But, of course, it is not very creditable to a great Government like our own to commence a public work and when it is half or two-thirds or six-sevenths completed to drop it. It is true the Rivers and Harbors Committee at the time when I was its chairman did absolutely abandon some projects for which appropriations had been made for many years. Most of them have made their way back into the bill now, and they are very prominent in this bill and the appropriations for them are very large; but we did not feel that

we could altogether abandon work which had been recommended and appropriated for during the time of our predecessors. The way to handle such a project as this is to stop it before it is commenced. There are two other locks and dams in this river less favorably situated for the increase of traffic than this Colbert and Bee Tree Shoals Canal, one to cost \$1,600,000 and the other \$1,000,000, which will be continued toward completion unless Congress at this session and in this bill declares that it does not want any more such waste as this Colbert and Bee Tree Shoals Canal has proved in the years 1912 and 1913.

I say with confidence that the proposed canals are less promising than this one, because, if you were to look at the cities of Florence and Sheffield and others in the neighborhood, situated less than 20 miles from the end of the stretch of the river, which is navigable all the year round, you would conclude that great benefit would be conferred by bringing them into touch with that stretch and giving them continuous all-year navigation.

I certainly regret if during the time I was chairman or a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee such large appropriations as this were made for a public work that has turned out so badly; but, in the first place, I repeat I do not see that I am to blame, as it had been commenced and prosecuted at an expense of \$700,000 before I ever knew of it. In the next place, suppose in those years 1902 and 1903 and 1905 we did think that such a plan might be successful; suppose we looked at the cities that would be made tributary to it and heard the arguments of chambers of commerce, listened to telegrams such as were sent in this morning, if we did make a mistake, then is that any reason why in this year 1914, with further information on the subject, we should make a still further mistake, one even worse than that, by passing river and harbor bills which sanction the construction of other public works and of two other locks and dams which do not promise as well as this one did?

I presume before I am through other things that I may have said, other things with which I may have had some connection will be quoted here to show that my course on this bill is inconsistent. But I shall not be troubled at all by that. The usual fault found with any action of mine during all the years when I was a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee was that I was too conservative; that I was not liberal enough. A cry went up from divers parts of the country that I was holding back improvements, and it was with the utmost difficulty that I succeeded in keeping down these bills to the amounts which they did carry. Unquestionably, items appeared which I did not altogether approve. Others were accepted by me and my colleagues because they were in continuance of projects already begun.

More than that, the country has learned something on this question of river traffic since 1902. The facts here speak most eloquently of the tendencies of river and harbor traffic. We know more on the subject than we knew then. I should very much regret if I felt that I myself did not have now in this year 1914 a more adequate understanding of many of the problems considered from 1896 to 1909 than I then had.

Mr. President, I desire to resume where I left off last night the argument in regard to greater simplicity in the reports of the engineers. It is exceedingly difficult for anyone who does not make a speciality of these subjects to gather from the great mass of data presented in these reports facts and circumstances relating to river and harbor works. I would suggest at the beginning of each description of a river project in volume 1 be given the following general facts:

- A. The general location of the river or harbor.
- B. The length under improvement.
- C. The natural depths and present depths available. That will compare the river in its natural and its present state.
- D. The present project. For instance, if the river in its natural state was 4 feet deep and it is now 6 feet, and it is expected to make it 8 feet, those facts should appear.
- E. The amount expended to date.
- F. The traffic in tons and the average haul.

That would take only about 8 or 10 lines. If those facts are given at the beginning, knowledge about river and harbor improvements would no longer be the possession of the few, but any Senator or Representative who desires to post himself upon the subject could learn at a brief glance the essential facts in regard to any project in the country. Some might say that is too much like the headline system of the newspapers, but however that may be, it would be decidedly useful and it would simplify the study of a subject which I am sure has not evoked the attention which it deserves. If it had received that attention, I do not believe we should have included in this bill and in some prior bills items costing millions and tens of millions

of dollars for which the United States Government is now expending money.

Supplementing what I have said, I wish to read extracts from several letters received from Gen. Kingman, who is an able and scientific officer and the Chief of our Engineer Corps, on the question of statistics. I read first from the letter of July 7. In corresponding with him I suggested that special agents be appointed as one way to obtain more accurate information. I raised the question whether these facts had best be gathered by the Engineer Corps or by some other branch of the public service. He says:

Relative to your suggestion that special agents be appointed for the express purpose of gathering statistics, I beg to say that I believe that much better results in proportion to the amount of money expended can be obtained without the appointment of such special agents than could be obtained by them. The statistics now are gathered by employees of the engineer department, who do other useful work when not engaged in commercial statistics work. The question is largely one of the relative cost and value of the statistics. Under existing laws it will be possible to collect, without the appointment of special agents, very accurate statistics, if sufficient money is spent; but it is believed that the statistics now reported, as a rule, are reasonably accurate, and that the extra refinement, which would add comparatively little to the value of the statistics, would enormously increase the cost of collection, and, as stated in my letter of July 2 to you, in many cases the cost would be no small proportion of the total cost of the improvement.

Mr. President, I do not quite agree with that last statement. The gathering of statistics is no expensive matter. It may be that the cost of collecting the statistics in some cases would bear a large proportion to the amount of traffic as in the Colbert and Bee Tree Shoals Canal, but the masters of vessels, those who navigate our rivers, are compelled by law to make a full and definite report. That has been the law for nearly 50 years, and the work of those who gather these figures is largely one of addition, subtraction, and classification.

In another letter of July 9 Gen. Kingman says:

Replying to your letter of July 8, 1914, upon the subject of commercial statistics, I would say that it might be a good thing to have a certain sum at the disposal of the Chief of Engineers, which might be allotted by him, in much the same way that survey money is allotted to the different engineering districts, for the purpose of obtaining more accurate commercial statistics than those which we now get. In the case of harbors the Government really has the machinery for collecting accurate commercial statistics with very little increased expenses, if it could be made use of. I refer to the employees at the custom-houses. They do have boarding officers and they do collect a great deal of information, and without much additional expense could collect it all.

When I was stationed in Oswego N. Y., a number of years ago I made a friendly arrangement with the collector of customs at that place whereby he caused his boarding officer to visit every vessel that came into the harbor, and being provided with printed blanks he got from the master the cargo, the place from whence it came, the part that was left at the harbor, and all that was taken away and where it was to go. This information when tabulated gave very correct and comprehensive results. I explained the method to the officer who was stationed at Duluth, and the method was put in force in that district, and the last that I heard of it they were still using it. That will do for the harbors. An extension of the system would cover the internal waterways.

I have not a very high opinion of the statistics that were collected years ago. The officers charged with this work did the best that they could, but the matter years ago was not regarded as of very great importance, and it was not thought that the expenditure of money in connection with it was justified. The statistics were generally obtained by correspondence with boards of trade, chambers of commerce, managers of steamboat lines, etc. Some of the information was doubtless duplicated, and some things were doubtless missed.

The collection of correct statistics is an art and requires both training and experience. When I first went to the Tennessee River I was satisfied that we were not getting full and complete statements of the amount of business done. I therefore prepared quite an elaborate plan. I ascertained from my own employees the name and home port of every steamboat plying on the system. I learned the name of every person engaged in rafting lumber, and I addressed letters to the masters of the boats and the owners of the rafts. I explained to them very carefully what the law was and what we were trying to do and how desirable it was in the interest of the improvement to have full, complete, and accurate statistics. I was gratified to find that I got a great deal better showing of commerce than we had ever had before. But I did not discover until it was too late for me to make use of the information that year that many of the statistics were inflated—absolutely exaggerated—and made two or three times as big as they ought to have been. So that afterwards I found it necessary to study very carefully all the reports received and afterwards to send an experienced man out to visit the parties from whom reports had been received and to carefully check up their statements and to get, if possible, the exact truth.

The most troublesome class of business to get on the small rivers is the business that is carried on by independent steamboats that are owned and operated by the master, a man who keeps no books, and is probably too illiterate to keep any, and who does his business on a cash basis or with a broomstick tally or something of that kind. If you go to him at the end of the year, he can not possibly tell you how much business he has done.

Finally I would say that in order to make statistics comparable and to make it possible to deduce correct conclusions by a comparison of results taken at considerable intervals of time, it is absolutely necessary that the same method of collecting the statistics should be used in all cases, or at least that methods should be adopted that are absolutely accurate within appreciable limits. I should be glad to do anything in my power to facilitate the collection of correct statistics, and I think one of the first things that should be done would be to find out who are collecting statistics and in this way to arrange a coordi-

nation of effort that should secure the greatest accuracy and avoid the duplication of results.

In a third letter, under date of July 13, he says:

I have your letter of July 11, 1914, in which you speak of my communication dated July 9. If there is anything in that letter that you could use for the good of the public service, I certainly have no objection to your doing so. If special provision were to be made for the collection, in a more thorough and accurate manner, of the commercial statistics of rivers and harbors under consideration, I should think that some increase in the contingent fund, with the authorization for its use for that purpose, would be all that would be necessary.

Mr. President, I regard this as a comparatively simple matter. It may cost \$50,000 or \$100,000, but that is a very small sum to spend when we have been groping in the dark for so long.

I am inclined to think the collection of the statistics had best be left to the Engineer Corps. I will resume reading the letter of Gen. Kingman:

I somewhat doubt the propriety of reporting ferry traffic as a part of the commercial statistics on a river. A ferryboat simply takes the place of a bridge, and, in fact, in the course of time is generally replaced by one. But where landing places are not opposite each other on a river, but many miles apart, there would be no objection to considering it, and there would be no objection to considering it in any case if it were a question of ton mileage, and was so reported. People naturally, without thinking very seriously of the subject when considering the commerce on a river, imagine that the commodities are transported over the entire length of the stream, although this is hardly ever the case; so that ton mileage is really the only valuable basis of general comparison, and this is expensive to collect accurately, and, in a way, such that the commerce of one stream can be properly compared with that of another.

That is the point to which I have repeatedly called attention—the importance of ton mileage in determining the importance of a stream as an artery of commerce.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter of the inadequacy of data and statistics on several different days, and my remarks therefore have been somewhat interrupted. With the indulgence of the Senate I desire to read a brief summary of my views on the subject of lack of statistics.

I.—LACK OF STATISTICS.

SUMMARY.

Deficiencies.

1. Lack of uniformity.

(a) Some figures are for the fiscal year ending June 30 and some are for calendar years.

(b) Classification of commodities is not uniform. The terms "miscellaneous," "general merchandise," "package freight," and so forth, are used indiscriminately. (See Report of National Waterways Commission, p. 74.)

(c) There should be a uniform rule for statistics relating to freight ferried across a river. In some cases this traffic is included in the general aggregate of traffic upon a river and in others it is not. On the Mississippi River, at and below St. Louis, ferry traffic is not included. On the other hand, for at least one year in the last decade, ferry traffic was included on the upper Mississippi. It is included on the Ohio River apparently at all points at which there are ferries. Traffic in the harbor of Philadelphia, more than 4,000,000 tons, ferried from Philadelphia to Camden, was included in the total for the last year for which statistics are available.

(d) In some cases, as on the Oconee and Ocmulgee, floating logs are excluded, though usually they are not. Indeed, they are included in almost every case.

Uniformity should be secured in the particulars above referred to by general order.

(e) There is no uniformity as regards stretches of a river or the different pools created by locks and dams. In some cases the traffic is given for the whole river as an entirety, naturally involving considerable duplication in the making up of the total.

As an example, the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans is divided into four sections—St. Louis to Cairo, Cairo to Memphis, Memphis to Vicksburg, Vicksburg to New Orleans.

It is impossible to derive from the figures the amount of through traffic. (See H. Doc. No. 50, 61st Cong., 1st sess., 1909, pp. 344, 345.)

On the other hand, on most rivers the traffic is given as an entirety on the whole river.

It is valuable to have statistics by stretches or portions of a river as well as for the whole river, especially when divided by locks and dams, but, at any rate, there should be a uniform rule.

II.—INADEQUACY OF STATISTICS.

(a) Ton mileage should be furnished. This is absolutely essential. The average haul and ton mileage is given on some streams but not on others.

Indeed, I think those figures are given for a comparatively small fraction of the streams; they may be given for one-fourth or perhaps one-third. The ton mileage is given for the traffic

through the Soo Canal, and that is exceedingly valuable and important.

The figures given are barely sufficient to give an adequate idea of tendencies.

(b) In order that the increase or decrease in traffic may be recognized, comparisons should be given for successive years. In the Report for 1912, volume 1, a considerable number of these comparisons are given. They are also given in numerous reports from the Corps of Engineers.

(c) The French publication "Statistique de la Navigation Intérieure," affords a good example to follow. Statistics relating to rivers and canals divide the traffic into two classes:

1. That originating on the river or portion of a river, which is again subdivided into traffic between points on the river or portions of the river in question, and that which originates within and is shipped outside.

2. The second class of traffic is made up of freight originating outside and then again subdivided into two classes:

(1) That which is shipped to points on the section in question from outside.

(2) Freight passing through without unloading.

(d) The total traffic on all rivers and canals should be given; also the kinds of freight carried.

(e) Receipts and shipments at the respective points of receipt and distribution should be given.

(f) It goes without saying that charges by boat per ton per mile for different classes of freight are extremely important.

(g) It is desirable that statistics should be published separately, either as an appendix to the Engineers Report or in a separate volume, and not scattered through the volumes. There are French and German publications devoted exclusively to statistics upon rivers and canals.

(h) It is desirable that traffic partly by sea and partly by river should be distinguished from that which is exclusively by river.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WEST. Before the Senator drifts too far from the matter, I should like to ask him if he knows why logs are not included in the ton mileage on the Ocmulgee?

Mr. BURTON. The Oconee and the Ocmulgee are the only two I recall now where floating logs are excluded.

Mr. WEST. Does the Senator know why logs are not included in the estimates of ton mileage on those rivers?

Mr. BURTON. My recollection is that the quantity of floated logs is given in the reports, but not in the general aggregate. The probable reason for that is that at some time difficulty was experienced in obtaining the statistics as to logs. I note that the quantity of floating logs is given on page 557 on the report pertaining to the Oconee.

Mr. WEST. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him further?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WEST. I merely wanted the information as to the Oconee and the Ocmulgee Rivers, because I know that at times timber has been a great part of the tonnage on those rivers.

Mr. BURTON. Indeed, I think the greater part at all times.

Mr. WEST. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURTON. On page 557, of the report, it is stated:

During the calendar year 1912 the amount of freight carried on the river between The Forks and Milledgeville amounted to 7,451 tons, valued at \$309,190. There was also rafted on this portion of the river during the same period 17,110,000 feet board measure of lumber, valued at \$287,150.

The 17,110,000 feet of lumber would weigh probably four times as much as the other traffic, if it were counted in the tonnage.

Mr. WEST. Four and a half times as much.

Mr. BURTON. Four and a half times as much. I have no doubt that the estimate of the Senator from Georgia is more accurate upon that than is my own estimate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Ohio, who has made a careful study of almost every waterway in the United States, whether as a rule before the Government expended money on these streams logs could not have been floated?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, yes; and they could be floated to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that connection I will say that an enormous commerce in logs has been floated down the Connecticut River, the Pemigewasset and the Winnepesaukee Rivers to the Merrimac and from there to market over shoal places

and other obstructions, but we never thought in our country of asking the Government to deepen those rivers to enable us to float logs to the market. It was more expensive no doubt than it would have been if we had an open channel, but our own people have done it at the expense of private parties, and I wondered, in remembering how shoal some of those streams are in places and how those logs have been manipulated by skilled men, whether there was an actual necessity for these improvements for the purpose of getting logs to market.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think one can make the broad generalization that the mere floating of logs ought to be eliminated from consideration in the improvement of streams. I do not say that a certain amount of improvement in the way of the removal of snags and possibly in some places dredging sand bars might not be justified, where the sole purpose was to float logs or timber, but that was a method of transportation long before the rivers were improved at the expense of the Government, and it never was in itself an excuse for improving any of them. It is not until recent years that we have come to realize how large a share of the traffic of such rivers as the Red and the Arkansas, and even the Tennessee, and a number of other streams is made up of floating logs. Indeed, when you deduct the floating logs there is hardly anything left, and yet we are paying enormous sums for improving the streams on the idea that it is necessary in the interest of navigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if the suggestion does not appeal to him that where streams are somewhat obstructed by snags or trees falling over them that private parties who are engaged in this great traffic ought not to remove those at their own expense?

Mr. BURTON. That is what has usually been done until the modern era of river and harbor legislation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is trying to instruct the Senate, and I notice there are very few Senators present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brady	Gronna	Overman	Sterling
Brandeggee	Hughes	Page	Stone
Bryan	James	Perkins	Swanson
Burton	Jones	Pittman	Thomas
Camden	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	Kern	Ransdell	Thornton
Chamberlain	Lane	Shafroth	Tillman
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	West
Clapp	Lewis	Shields	White
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Simmons	
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. Smoor entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I had understood the Chair to announce that a quorum was present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Forty-nine Senators?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Answering further the Senator from Georgia, I give also the figures for the Ocmulgee River, which are found on page 560 of the engineers' reports. In 1912 the freight carried on this river amounted to 9,528 short tons, valued at \$505,130. Besides this, 21,940,000 feet, board measure, of timber was rafted down the river, valued at \$317,000. It will appear that in this river, as well as the Oconee, the quantity of timber floated was, in tonnage, far in excess of the general freight. I conceive that the reason why it has been omitted in some years is that possibly in some seasons of the year the statistics were not readily available. I make this statement and include this generalization because in other publications the Oconee and Ocmulgee are given distinctive positions. The asterisk accompanies the statement of tonnage, and reference is made to the fact that this does not include floated logs. That is true of the Statistical Abstract and other publications.

It is exceedingly difficult to find these figures, though by the use of a number of publications and by correspondence with the commercial bodies some very valuable figures are obtainable. If I were to express an opinion, I would say that those of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis are the most valuable of those furnished by any commercial organization relating to the rivers of the country. Other valuable statistics are furnished from Cincinnati, from New Orleans, and some from Chicago.

While I am on this subject I may say that if anyone desires to study river traffic, the best publication for its comprehensiveness in statistics is the report of the Inland Waterways Commission, published in the year 1908. At that time a strenuous

effort was made to compile a list of abandoned canals to show the tendencies as to water-borne traffic on rivers and canals, and to give the available figures relating to tonnage up to that date. The Bureau of Corporations took up the subject, and President Roosevelt cooperated in the work. The statistics published in that report give very complete figures down to and including the years 1906 and 1907. It is to be regretted that this publication could not be continued down to date. Then the report of the National Waterways Commission published in 1910 and 1912—the preliminary report in 1910 and the final report in 1912—gives a class of statistics equally valuable; but the aim of that publication is not so much to furnish statistics as generalizations, and hence the figures given are much less comprehensive than those contained in the report of the Inland Waterways Commission. There are other publications, such as the Statistical Abstract, the Report on Transportation by Water, and divers census reports, which have very considerable value; but none of them can compare with the publications which are available in France and Germany, particularly those in France.

Briefly commenting on the inadequacy of our statistics, I have said a great deal in regard to ton mileage, and I think it will be recognized by everyone that it is not merely the number of tons that are handled on a river that is important, but the distance that freight is carried. If tonnage alone is considered, the ferriage traffic between two cities, merely crossing a river at some point where there is no bridge, might seem to give to a stream an importance for commerce which did not belong to one of far greater magnitude and commercial importance. It is only for a few years that these figures have been gathered in this country at all. Anyone who examines them, and who has labored under the impression referred to in Gen. Kingman's letter, that when a certain amount of tonnage is ascribed to a river it was carried for the whole length of the river, must have experienced a rude shock, for it appears that the great bulk of our river traffic on most of these rivers, even those of large size and very considerable importance, is hauled for only short distances.

In order that the increase or decrease in traffic may be recognized, comparisons should be given for successive years. In France these comparisons are available from 1847 to 1912 and statistics on a large and general scale from 1895 to 1912. On some rivers in the United States they are available from 1890 to 1912 or 1913, but with the qualification that the method of taking the statistics is by no means uniform; so the comparison is not so reliable as it otherwise might be. I have referred at some length in the summary given above to the French publication as an example.

The total traffic on all rivers and canals should be given, also the kinds of freight carried. It is exceedingly desirable that we should have the whole amount of freight carried on rivers in the United States aggregated in one total. If we did, and if we had a comparison by years, we could readily judge of the tendencies relating to water-borne transportation. With great labor I have tried to figure out this problem, and find that it is hardly possible to give any satisfactory figure of the aggregate traffic; but it is possible to find enough to determine what the tendencies are. Later in my argument I shall refer more fully to the inferences which may be derived from the figures available.

It is also very desirable that the different classes of commodities conveyed on all the rivers of the country should be grouped; that is, which are the principal articles of water-borne commerce? Is it package freight? Is it grain? Is it building material? Is it coal? Is it raw material for manufacture? What are the tendencies? Is the quantity of coarse material increasing out of proportion to the others? What is the tendency as to general merchandise—merchandise of considerable value per ton?

The figures relating to the French traffic show that the leading article carried on all the rivers and canals of France is building material, and that comprises about a third of the total; next in order comes coal and different mineral combustibles for fuel; next to that agricultural products and provisions. The importance of these different figures, the increase or decrease from year to year, can not be overstated. Indeed, where they are accurately obtained they show tendencies so plainly that it is impossible to deny or avoid the inference which can be derived from them.

Receipts and shipments at the respective points of receipt and distribution should be given. These figures are now given with reference to our harbors very carefully and very adequately; but on the rivers, strangely, nothing of the kind appears, save in an occasional document like that upon the wall; and that does not take up fully, as the French statistics do, the

different ports on the river as separate places of receipt and shipment.

Another item of statistics which I have included under the head "F" is charges by boat per ton per mile for different classes of freight. The engineers' reports are just beginning to furnish these, and they give very important information. We have had these figures for 20 years or more—yes; I think for 30 years—on freight passing through the Soo Canal. I may say in passing that the statistics gathered there—and they are gathered by the engineers with very little difficulty—are a model to follow. They are among the most valuable statistics furnished anywhere in the world. They show the classes of commodities passing through, the exact quantity of each, the value of all, and the rate per ton per mile.

Strangely, those commodities have varied very little in value for more than 20 years. The average value is between \$10 and \$12 per ton, showing that the great bulk of the freight is made up of coarse material, such as iron ore and coal. The figures also show that there has been a very substantial reduction year by year in the rate paid on freights going through.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WEST. Does not greater tonnage pass through the Soo Canal than through any other canal in the world?

Mr. BURTON. Much greater. Something over 70,000,000 tons pass through there. In making that statement, however, it is necessary to add the qualifying statement that the statistics at the Soo, as it is called—the St. Marys River Canal—are taken on a different principle or rule from those at the Suez. In fact, they are much more complete. At the Soo statistics are gathered of the net tonnage of all boats passing through, and also of the actual freight carried. At the Suez Canal they only gather statistics of the net tonnage. They do not attempt to obtain figures as to the aggregate quantity of freight, the weight of the cargoes of the vessels. For everything under the sun there is a reason, and there is a reason for this. They charge tolls on the basis of the tonnage. It would be regarded as impracticable to ascertain the quantity of all the respective cargoes. Again, the imposition of tolls upon the quantity of freight would throw the door wide open for fraud, or at least require such minute measurement as to be impracticable. It is in every way more convenient in fixing charges to determine the rates according to the tonnage; that is, by the capacity of the vessel, and not by the cargo that is hauled.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I see the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce here I should like to ask him what is to be the program with reference to the trust legislation. Are we going to postpone that now until the river and harbor bill is disposed of?

Mr. SIMMONS. Did the Senator ask me a question? If so, I did not hear it.

Mr. BORAH. I was asking the Senator from Nevada, but I am willing that the Senator from North Carolina shall speak.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Nevada is present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It has been the sense of the Interstate Commerce Committee that it should not press the trade commission bill until it has disposed of the securities bill now pending before it, the view being that there is quite a general demand upon both sides of the Chamber that all the so-called trust legislation should be reported to the Senate before we acted finally upon any of the bills. The Interstate Commerce Committee prepared its final draft yesterday, and it is printed to-day and is now under the inspection of the various members of the committee with a view to final action to-morrow morning, when we hope to report that bill.

As to the Clayton bill pending before the Judiciary Committee, I am told that the bill is finally shaped and the report is being written and that it will be filed to-morrow.

So whilst I did expect that these reports would be filed to-day and that we would be able to proceed with the trade commission bill to-day, I find that the condition is such that we will not be able to proceed with it until to-morrow. Then I shall expect to press the bill vigorously.

Mr. BORAH. I understand, then, the program will be not to delay longer than to-morrow.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No.

Mr. BORAH. Whether other bills are reported or not? If the other two bills are not reported, I understand we will go ahead with the trade commission bill to-morrow, anyway.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; that is my intention.

Mr. BORAH. I have no intention to find fault or to criticize. While there is some difference of opinion on this side of the Chamber, speaking for myself I am not in favor of the commission bill as it stands, but I am ready to help it to its final passage, or any other trust legislation that has to go through.

Mr. KENYON. I understood the Senator from Nevada to say last week that he would vigorously press the trade commission bill. He now states that he will vigorously press it some time in the future; but evidently the bill is not to be pressed this afternoon. As we have now spent some hour and a half on the river and harbor bill, it seems to me there is a measure of much more importance that should be considered by the Senate. I gave notice on the 9th day of March that I would ask for the consideration of Senate bill 392 at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The river and harbor bill is the unfinished business, I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa what is the bill that he speaks of?

Mr. KENYON. It is a bill to place on the retired list the volunteer officers of the Civil War. Their average age is now 76 years. There has been an earnest effort made on the part of their friends throughout the country to induce Congress to take up this measure. It has been before Congress for a great many years. The Committee on Military Affairs finally reported it out, and it is on the calendar. We have tried time and time again to get it up. There is going to be plenty of opportunity, apparently, to consider the river and harbor bill, and this bill would not bring out very much discussion. I think we could dispose of it this afternoon. It is a mere act of justice to these old veterans of the Civil War. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 392.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What is the bill?

Mr. KENYON. It is what is termed the volunteer officers' retired bill.

Mr. BORAH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa if that is not the same bill the Senator or some other Senator upon the other side moved to take up and displace the river and harbor bill a few days ago?

Mr. KENYON. I made no motion to take it up. I think some one did move to take it up. I earnestly hope it may displace the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] moved to take up the bill the other day.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I was about to state that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] the other day made this same motion. I am very much in favor of the bill referred to by the Senator from Iowa. I took an active interest in its promotion before the committee, and I am willing to do everything I can to further its passage, but the Senators on the other side certainly can not be acting in the interest, in the real interest, of these old soldiers when they undertake to give this bill a partisan cast and undertake time after time and time after time to displace an appropriation bill that must be passed, using it as a sort of a weapon for that purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. KERN. My judgment is—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire rises to a point of order, which he will state.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is not a debatable question; and if it is to be debated, I want to have it left open, because I want to say something in reply to what the Senator from Indiana states.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it is not debatable, and there is a call for the regular order. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa to proceed to the consideration of the bill, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Cummins	Overman	Smoot
Borah	Gallinger	Page	Stone
Brady	Gronna	Perkins	Thomas
Brandegee	Hollis	Pittman	Thompson
Bryan	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thornton
Burton	Kern	Saulsbury	Weeks
Cañon	Lane	Shafroth	West
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	White
Chilton	Lippitt	Shields	Works
Clapp	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. MYERS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have responded to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. JAMES, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. SWANSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. CAMDEN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRISTOW, and Mr. HUGHES entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa, to take up the bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I vote "nay." I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. He is absent, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] and vote "yea."

Mr. HOLLIS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], but under the terms of it I have a right to vote as I please on this kind of a question, and I will let my vote stand.

Mr. STONE (after having voted in the negative). I voted, but I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and let my vote stand.

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask if the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. LIPPITT. As I have a pair with that Senator I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have announced my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I now desire

to transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. HOLLIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 32—as follows:

YEAS—19.

Borah	Cañon	Jones	Sterling
Brady	Clapp	Kenyon	Thompson
Brandegee	Cummins	Page	Weeks
Bristow	Gallinger	Smith, Mich.	Works
Burton	Gronna	Smoot	

NAYS—32.

Bankhead	Kern	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Lane	Reed	Smith, Md.
Camden	Lewis	Saulsbury	Stone
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Sheppard	Thornton
Hollis	Nelson	Shields	Tillman
Hughes	Overman	Simmons	West
James	Perkins	Smith, Ariz.	White

NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Gore	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Chamberlain	Johnson	Oliver	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Owen	Thomas
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Penrose	Townsend
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Vardaman
Culberson	Lippitt	Poincxter	Walsh
Dillingham	Lodge	Pomerene	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Robinson	Williams
Fall	McLean	Root	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	
Goff	Newlands	Shively	

So Mr. KENYON's motion was rejected.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in dwelling upon the deficiency of our statistics, I would add that it is extremely desirable that the figures relating to traffic should be separately published. At present they are scattered through several volumes and are given but incidental attention. It was not until about 12 years ago that any importance seems to have been attached to the traffic on the rivers and harbors which were being improved. At that time when delegations came to Washington to ask for appropriations they were invariably confronted with the question, "What is the present and prospective traffic of the river or harbor whose improvement you advocate?" Immediately commercial bodies began to realize the importance of those figures. They cooperated with the engineers, and, as a result, our statistics were made much more comprehensive and perfect.

There is, I think, a general tendency to exaggerate the amount of traffic. For instance, in an improvement upon which a report was made to Congress, the local engineer expressed his doubt upon the accuracy of the figures given, stating that he could not see how the traffic could be so large. The board of review, in going more deeply into the question, found that the amount of existing traffic had been multiplied by 10. There have been other instances in which on careful analysis the figures have been found altogether untrustworthy; but with a careful review, with that scrutiny which the respective engineers would naturally give to the reports made by chambers of commerce and other bodies—more frequently, I may say, these erroneous reports are made by individuals who advocate an improvement—I do not think there is much question that accurate results can be obtained if sufficient effort is put forth.

These figures should be published either as an appendix to the Engineers report or, better still, in a separate volume, such as is the custom in France and also Germany, though in a somewhat less degree. It is especially desirable that the traffic, partly by sea and partly by river, should be distinguished from that which is exclusively by river. A great deal of confusion has arisen from a lack of this discrimination. For instance, there is no similarity between the traffic on the Delaware River below Philadelphia and the traffic on the Mississippi River above New Orleans; nor is there any natural basis for comparison between the traffic on the Mississippi River below New Orleans and that above that city. The traffic below New Orleans is almost exclusively in connection with the sea; it is made up of the freight brought in and carried out by boats which sail thereon to the Gulf and carry their cargoes to foreign lands or to the seaports of this country, while the traffic above New Orleans on the Mississippi River is almost exclusively, in strict

terms, river traffic. I say that with the exception, in order that I may be entirely understood, that occasional boats go up to Baton Rouge from the Gulf. There is a sufficient draft for that purpose, there being perhaps 30 feet all the way to Baton Rouge; but taking the traffic to which I refer on the Delaware River below Philadelphia, that between different points on the river is trivial. There is, however, a traffic of more than 20,000,000 tons brought in from or carried out to the sea. That same distinction is observable everywhere.

In foreign countries the importance of the Thames below London as a local stream is not of importance, but the river is of supreme importance as affording access to the North Sea for the great traffic of the port of London. We may take also the case of minor rivers, such as the Kennebec, leading to Augusta; the Penobscot, leading to Bangor; and the Connecticut, leading to Hartford. That traffic is partly by river and partly by sea. The cities of Bangor and Augusta have a through line from Boston and the city of Hartford has a through line from New York. The boats sail from New York through the East River and Long Island Sound to the mouth of the Connecticut, and then go up the river to Hartford. This is in no sense river traffic in the manner in which that term is ordinarily used.

Mr. President, I now pass from this first branch of the inquiry. It is perhaps fit that I should apologize to the Senate for having given so much attention to the question of facts and statistics, but, view this question as we will, there is the source of the whole difficulty. We have been improving rivers and we have been improving harbors without adequate understanding of the results. Figures are now available, though not in the abundance which I should like, to show certain tendencies. When those tendencies are understood we shall cease making many of the appropriations that we have been making; we will realize that streams which have been developed at great expense may have been useful arteries of commerce in the past but they are not so now, and the future holds out no prospects that they ever will be.

Possibly a change may occur. Almost every year we read in the newspapers or we hear from delegations of a new type of steamboat or barge which it is maintained will revolutionize conditions and restore the waning traffic on rivers. Again, almost every year we read or hear of some new boat line on some of the rivers which will rejuvenate traffic and give to the streams upon which it is located a restoration of the former conditions when boats were numerous; but usually, after the lapse of a year or two, the old conditions recur—the new style of boat is found not to be much better than the old style, and the new boat line is found to be unprofitable. Oftentimes there have been instances in which at the end of the week—it may be on Saturday night—an association of business men has made a declaration that they would give their traffic to a new boat line on the river, but on Monday morning they are making arrangements with the railroads for carrying the freight in the old way. I think nothing less than a sworn oath would make it sure that those shippers who for a time are so enthusiastic for river traffic will patronize the rivers to any very considerable extent. It thus becomes necessary for us to review this whole subject, to ascertain where we are, and to analyze these different propositions before us, so that we may act wisely in the making of appropriations. We shall find, when we recognize present conditions, that they are very different from those of the past; that rivers and streams which were utilized profitably 20 or 30 years ago are without promise of profit for the future.

Improvements of harbors have in general produced much better results than those upon rivers. This is especially true of ports of major importance, like Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, New Orleans, Galveston, and many harbors on the Great Lakes.

The table hereafter given sets forth a statement of harbors on which more than \$5,000,000 has been expended by the Federal Government in the relative order of their commerce either for the calendar year 1912 or for the fiscal year 1913, according as statistics are available. The expenditures to June 30, 1913, are also given.

It will be noted that there is included in this list the sums expended on rivers, some of which are of considerable length, in that portion which connects a port with the sea. I have already mentioned the fact that the rivers leading to certain ports are not, in the ordinary sense, devoted to river transportation, but that they are utilized merely for connection with the sea. The most notable examples of these are the Delaware to Philadelphia, the Patapsco to Baltimore, the Columbia and Willamette to Portland, the Mississippi to New Orleans, the Savannah to Savannah, the St. Johns River to Jacksonville, and

the Cape Fear River to Wilmington, N. C. It is quite as essential that the expenditure for the improvement of these rivers which afford access to the sea should be included under the head of harbors as that a bay, such as Massachusetts Bay, which affords access to Boston, or Mobile Bay, which furnishes means of communication to Mobile, should be included under the head of expenditures upon harbors. I concede that it is exceedingly difficult to make a satisfactory classification, but the one adopted is the most accurate. The following is a list of harbors on which more than \$5,000,000 has been spent, in the order of their commerce:

Harbors on which more than \$5,000,000 has been spent, in the relative order of their commerce for last year.

Harbor.	Commerce.	Expenditures to June 30, 1913.
	Tons.	
New York Harbor.....	190,000,000	\$7,339,284.35
Ambrose Channel.....	14,188,489	5,103,519.00
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels.....	5,384,285	4,146,100.00
Hudson River Channel.....	72,000,000	225,000.00
East River and Hell Gate.....	45,331,216	6,233,341.00
Duluth-Superior.....	41,474,776	7,662,213.60
Philadelphia:		
(Channel to the sea.....)	26,267,335	19,189,000.00
Harbor.....		6,809,200.00
Buffalo.....	17,923,766	5,782,821.53
Cleveland.....	14,296,078	7,102,654.03
Baltimore, Patapsco River.....	10,029,875	8,616,280.00
Columbia River mouth and to Portland.....	9,538,646	15,525,789.00
New Orleans.....	4,279,947	10,357,288.00
Galveston Harbor.....	4,117,524	9,932,834.34
Savannah to Savannah.....	3,120,676	10,456,747.00
Boston.....	3,091,362	11,176,774.74
Mobile Bay and Harbor.....	2,210,486	6,888,080.17
St. Johns to Jacksonville.....	2,204,794	6,060,089.00
Cape Fear to Wilmington.....	1,072,205	5,831,168.00
Charleston.....	986,206	5,162,049.24

¹ Estimated tonnage for port of New York, no accurate statistics being available, vessels trading with domestic ports not being required to take out clearance papers. See page 243, volume 1, and page 1680, volume 2, Engineers Reports for 1913.

² Foreign commerce only. Prepared from statistics of the New York State Chamber of Commerce. See page 1680, volume 2, Engineers Reports for 1913.

³ The Duluth and Superior projects were combined by the act of June 3, 1896. This figure includes \$574,246.82 expended prior to that date for Duluth, and \$695,883.80 expended prior to that date on Superior Bay.

⁴ This figure includes 4,685,234 tons carried on car floats between Philadelphia and Camden.

⁵ Of this amount \$3,950,000 was expended on the Philadelphia Harbor. See page 1749, volume 2, Engineers Reports, 1913.

⁶ This includes local traffic not passing to and from Portland through the mouth of the Columbia.

⁷ This includes the South Pass and the Southwest Pass.

⁸ This does not include all of the traffic of Boston, but the figures are the best available.

First comes New York Harbor. This stands far and away at the head, with an estimated commerce of 90,000,000 tons. It is true that this figure includes freight carried by ferries, and that the traffic of that harbor, with its different channels, when you take into account ferriage, domestic commerce, and foreign commerce, presents such complications that it is almost impossible to arrive at any satisfactory figure. It is nevertheless true that it is the leading harbor in the United States, and, judging by volume of traffic, it is no doubt the greatest harbor in the world.

Those who are proud of this country, of its production, of its commerce, and of its transportation facilities can hardly realize the importance of the features which give supremacy to New York Harbor. It has three characteristics which, taken together, make it stand out in a class by itself. First is the ease of access from the sea. The best approach from the south for an ocean steamship seeking the wharves at New York is through the so-called Ambrose Channel, 2,000 feet in width and 40 feet in depth—a depth, without counting the tide of some 6 feet, sufficient to admit at all stages the largest boat in the world, and with a width which gives abundant seaway. This approach is protected at the entrance by Long Island on the north and by the New Jersey coast on the west, giving it an advantage over any harbor in the world in its protection from the troublesome winds, those from the north and from the west.

There is a similar advantage, though less marked, in the access through Long Island Sound and the East River. While storms of considerable violence sometimes prevail on Long Island Sound, there is here also a large body of water in which there is the best of protection from the wind and from the difficulties which many boats experience in approaching a safe haven. The second feature of importance is the very great area—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gallinger	Pittman	Sterling
Borah	Hollis	Ransdell	Stone
Brady	Hughes	Reed	Swanson
Bryan	James	Saulsbury	Thomas
Burton	Jones	Shafroth	Thornton
Camden	Kern	Sheppard	Tillman
Catron	Martin, Va.	Simmons	West
Chamberlain	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	White
Chilton	Page	Smith, Ga.	
Cummins	Perkins	Smoot	

Mr. JONES. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] are detained on the business of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the call been concluded, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I had reference to. Has the announcement been made as to the number of Senators present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. LANE responded to his name when called.

Mr. CLAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. POMERENE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request absent Senators to attend the sessions of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will request Senators who are absent to attend the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. NEWLANDS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is very warm in the Chamber, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. KERN. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer as on a previous vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HOLLIS. I am paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHILTON. Under the terms of my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] I can vote upon this question. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DULLINGHAM] to the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—8.			
Brady	Cummins	Page	Smoot
Burton	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
NAYS—36.			
Bankhead	Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Nelson
Bryan	Hollis	Lee, Md.	Overman
Camden	Hughes	Lewis	Perkins
Chamberlain	James	Martin, Va.	Pittman
Chilton	Kern	Martine, N. J.	Pomerene

Ransdell	Sheppard	Smith, Md.	Thornton
Reed	Simmons	Stone	Tillman
Saulsbury	Smith, Ariz.	Swanson	West
Shafroth	Smith, Ga.	Thomas	White

NOT VOTING—52.

Ashurst	Fall	McCumber	Shields
Borah	Fletcher	McLean	Shively
Brandegge	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Goff	Newlands	Stephenson
Burleigh	Gore	Norris	Sterling
Catron	Groun	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Clapp	Hitchcock	Oliver	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson	Owen	Townsend
Coit	Jones	Penrose	Vardaman
Crawford	Kenyon	Poindexter	Walsh
Cullerson	La Follette	Robinson	Warren
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Williams
du Pont	Lodge	Sherman	Works

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The principle is well established that it does not require a quorum to carry a motion to adjourn; but does it not require a quorum to determine that a body shall not adjourn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it does not. This was upon a call of the Senate for the purpose of determining whether a quorum was in attendance.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; this was a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And a motion pending that does not require a majority of the Senate to respond.

Mr. GALLINGER. Personally I should be glad to have the Chair at his convenience point out to me the rule that justifies that ruling. I shall not appeal from it, of course. It is well understood that if the majority votes to adjourn it does not require a quorum; but when a motion is made to adjourn and a quorum is not developed and the decision is adverse to the motion to adjourn, I do not think there is any rule that justifies the position that a quorum is not to be considered necessary.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Why does the Chair call for me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because there was not a quorum on the roll call, and the Senator from Arkansas is not recorded as present at that time.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas answered to his name.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I understand, the call now is to develop a quorum, which was interrupted by my motion, to adjourn; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The original call of a quorum is still open, and the Sergeant at Arms is endeavoring to get Senators here.

Mr. KENYON, Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, and Mr. BRISTOW entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, at the time my remarks were interrupted I was describing the second characteristic feature of excellence in New York Harbor. That is the very ample space for anchorage and the movement of vessels afforded by the wide expanse in the lower and the upper bay and the narrower channels in the Hudson River and in the East River, together with a number of subsidiary channels near at hand, such as the Kill Van Kull and the Arthur Kill. In this regard there is an exceptional amount of space for fleets to anchor and move about in waters of ample depth and width.

The third characteristic in which New York Harbor is absolutely supreme among all harbors is the facility with which freight can be transferred from the sea to the land and from the land to the sea. If a skilled draftsman had undertaken the task of preparing a plan for a harbor in which there would be the utmost convenience in reaching wharves and in providing space for the transfer of freight, he could not have surpassed what nature has furnished at New York Harbor. He might possibly have made Manhattan Island narrower, so that there would be only sufficient space for wharfage, for warehouses, and for railroad tracks to bring and take away the traffic; but if he had done that there would have been no space for population on the island. The abundance of land abutting on deep channels is phenomenal. The truth of this statement will be readily recognized by anyone who considers the water front extending from Bay Ridge and Red Hook along the westerly side of Brooklyn and that on the Hudson River, both on the New York and Jersey sides; on the East River, Newtown Creek in Brooklyn; farther away on the Kill Van Kull, the Arthur Kill, and other channels almost too numerous to mention. Nevertheless, with all this abundance of space, the harbor is congested, which is a proof of the enormous traffic in this great commercial course.

The expenditures on this harbor and adjacent channels, not including the Kill Van Kull and the Arthur Kill, and the Hud-

son River above New York, have been for the harbor proper \$7,239,284, and for the Ambrose Channel, \$5,103,510. Of this amount \$4,000,000 was appropriated and authorized in the act of 1899. There was considerable delay in the completion of the work, due to the fact that there was no dredging equipment in the world adequate for undertaking the task of digging so wide and so deep a channel. The Government was compelled to build dredges of its own. The amount of \$4,000,000 proved inadequate, and the further sum of \$1,103,510 was appropriated and authorized in the act of 1907. It was something over 10 years after the first appropriation for this channel on the 31 of March, 1899, and its final completion. The Bay Ridge and Red Hook channel received an appropriation of \$4,146,100. The Hudson River channel opposite the wharves, between New York on the one side and Jersey City and Hoboken on the other, received \$225,000. Nature made here a channel of extraordinary depth and there has been very little necessity for dredging except in the portion near land, and that only in a small amount.

The amount appropriated for East River and Hell Gate, between New York City and Brooklyn, has been \$6,233,341, making a total of nearly \$23,000,000 for this harbor proper and for the channels immediately adjacent to it.

Of course an enormous additional sum has been expended for wharves and docks by private parties and by the city.

Mr. President, we may contemplate with pride the results that have been obtained by Government expenditures in this locality. Compared with this \$23,000,000, a dock company, the Mersey Channel & Dock Co., in the city of Liverpool, has expended \$130,000,000 to improve Liverpool Harbor. Of course the comparison is not an exact one, because the latter amount includes expenditures for basins, into which boats may go and load or unload their cargoes free from the influence of the tide. The tide is so considerable at Liverpool as to be a very disturbing factor. But we have, nevertheless, the fact that the Government of the United States has spent upon this magnificent harbor, so colossal in all the features that make up a port, but \$23,000,000, as against an expenditure of \$130,000,000 on the harbor of Liverpool.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. What does the Senator say about the ownership of the terminals at New York Harbor? Do not the railroads own a large part of the terminals there?

Mr. BURTON. Not on the water front. Those belong almost exclusively to the city. They are, however, leased to different steamship companies and to railroads.

Mr. KENYON. In a large number of our harbors are not the terminals owned entirely by the railroads?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator contemplates discussing that proposition?

Mr. BURTON. I may perhaps touch upon it, but I think that is hardly relevant to the present discussion. The question of public ownership or private ownership has been very much discussed in connection with conditions in New York Harbor on the Hudson River front. It has been maintained by some who are earnestly interested in the welfare of the city that private ownership would have been better than public ownership. I am not ready myself to accept that opinion. Leases are made, and made at very high figures, to steamship companies and to railroads.

Mr. KENYON. How is it where the water fronts are owned almost entirely by the railroads?

Mr. BURTON. That would be a great disadvantage. I shall touch on that subject.

Mr. KENYON. Congress is called upon to appropriate the money, and ought there not to be some provision by which there should be public wharves and public terminals?

Mr. BURTON. That is a question which I shall discuss.

Mr. KENYON. Otherwise they would be merely for the benefit of the railroads.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa where these terminals are owned by railroads to any great extent?

Mr. KENYON. The Commissioner of Corporations has made a very extended report upon the subject of transportation by water in the United States and part 3 deals almost entirely with that question. If the Senator will refer to that it will answer the question better than I can. I remember very distinctly in the discussion some years ago of the Panama toll proposition the Senator from New York referred to certain harbors in Connecticut where the water front was owned entirely by the New

York, New Haven & Hartford, and, I think, there was one in New London.

Mr. GALLINGER. Bridgeport, more particularly.

Mr. BURTON. In this connection I will say in some harbors that is a decided feature and a disadvantage. So in the river and harbor bill for the year 1905 a provision was inserted providing for an improvement, where railroad control seemed probable, to the effect that charges on the wharves should be under regulation of the Secretary of War, and in other bills since then similar provisions have been enacted requiring that the community most interested should secure proper wharfage facilities which were not under a monopoly. That is the substance of the requirement.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to suggest, if the Senator will permit me, if these privileges are leased at reasonable amounts there would be no great objection to ownership by railroads which run directly to those wharves. But, of course, if there is a monopoly and an excessive charge there ought to be some method of remedying it.

Mr. KENYON. Where the railroad owns its own terminal, the entire front of the harbor, and by that very fact excludes others from the business.

Mr. GALLINGER. If there was any remedy we could apply I think it ought to be done in cases of that kind.

Mr. BURTON. I shall take up that subject a little later.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask for information as to where the increase of wharfage and terminal facilities will be found later on, if the commerce of New York City grows, as we expect it will grow, with the opening of the enlarged Erie Barge Canal to Buffalo.

Mr. BURTON. One place would be secured by deepening shallow water on the west side in New Jersey, in very plain sight of the Statue of Liberty. I am not certain but this has already been made available, at least a part of it. Another, by extending the wharves up the Hudson River. Still another, on the water front of Long Island in and around Brooklyn. So there is almost unlimited opportunity. Of course, the proposition has been made to have ocean steamships stop at Montauk, at the east end of Long Island. That proposition received very considerable support 10 or 15 years ago. The situation is this: That with increased depth and greater loads and increased traffic it is almost impossible to keep pace with the demands of commerce.

I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the number of tons handled in New York Harbor has doubled in the time I have been connected with river and harbor legislation, within probably 10 years.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator by what amount he thinks the traffic will be increased, either in tons or in percentage, owing to the large expenditure of \$101,000,000 by the State of New York to widen and deepen the Erie Canal?

Mr. BURTON. By the way, let me give another place, the Harlem River. That is another place that may be utilized—the Harlem River—leaving the Hudson above New York, and coming down to East River. There some of the barge traffic could be accommodated. Does the Senator ask what percentage of increased traffic there will be?

Mr. PAGE. Yes. That is, traffic due to the opening of the canal from Buffalo to the Hudson River, with a depth of 12 feet.

Mr. BURTON. I would think it would increase the traffic, but I should not anticipate that this alone would add a very great percentage to the traffic which already exists. The increase in the future will be due quite as much to the normal increase of domestic and foreign traffic as it will be to the construction of that barge canal.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Senator anticipate that the traffic between the St. Lawrence River and New York City will be very materially increased when the Narrows of Lake Champlain are made 12 feet in depth?

Mr. BURTON. When the Canadian Government finishes its part of it north of Lake Champlain?

Mr. PAGE. Yes. On the Richelieu River.

Mr. BURTON. Yes. I would anticipate the development of very considerable traffic. In the present Narrows of Lake Champlain the amount of traffic going through is, I believe, a little over 500,000 tons.

Mr. PAGE. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Some years ago it was more than that; it was about 700,000 tons. The traffic of New York Harbor is now about 90,000,000 tons. You can see that any probable in-

crease from that source is not going to add a very great percentage to the space already in demand.

Mr. PAGE. The question in my mind was as to the extent of the traffic through the lake, which is now practically shut off to a large extent, because the large boats now run south only to Ticonderoga. In the channel south of Ticonderoga there is only 5 or 6 feet depth of water a good part of the time, but with the channel deepened to 12 feet, as is now proposed, so that large barges may load grain at Quebec, Montreal, Three Rivers, and other points on the St. Lawrence, it seems to me the great grain product of eastern Canada will eventually find its way down the Richelieu River, Lake Champlain, the Champlain Canal, and the Hudson River to New York.

Mr. BURTON. I should think that problematical. It might be, but that grain is already near the great river of St. Lawrence, and the distance to Europe is shorter by the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence than through the Richelieu River, Lake Champlain, Champlain Canal, and the Hudson River to New York and then by ship from there.

Then, another thing, you have all the governmental regulations, and every effort will be made in Canada to provide for shipping that grain by a water route directly connecting Canada with European ports.

Mr. PAGE. But the Senator must remember that during a good part of the year the St. Lawrence River is closed by ice. Of course, navigation would be closed through Lake Champlain as well; but for all that there is a large lumber, pulp, and grain traffic there that it seems to me may be developed both from Quebec and from Montreal which will eventually increase the Lake Champlain and Hudson River traffic to a very great extent.

Mr. BURTON. I think so; but as to that grain traffic I doubt very much.

There is one point in this connection to be taken into account. There are facilities for shallow draft boats in and near New York. It is very much easier to provide wharfage facilities and warehouses for traffic that comes through a barge canal 12 feet deep than it is to provide for the ocean traffic. The ocean traffic comes in on boats from nearly 40 feet draft down to 20 and 15 feet, and in order that they may obtain wharves at which they may unload their cargoes it is necessary that there be deep water. There is a large amount of channel room around New York which would provide for boats or barges from a barge canal 12 feet deep, but which would not provide for one of these ocean steamers. So that probably will be a comparatively simple problem. The great strain is to obtain deep and not shallow water frontage such as would be required for boats from the canal. I should fancy that the Harlem River would provide for some of it, and that it might be barged into some of the shallow harbors and river channels in and around New York and Brooklyn, possibly clear around Coney Island to Jamaica Bay. It should be remembered that much of the freight brought from the canal will be consumed in Greater New York and near-by points. Another class of freight may be intended for transshipment, and for this deep channels are desirable, so that a transfer may be made to ocean steamers.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he anticipates that in the next half century there will be a type of boat built drawing only 12 feet of water that will take freight at Buffalo or Montreal and bring it through these canals to New York and then proceed coastwise without transshipping?

Mr. BURTON. That opens up a very broad question. Of course it is possible to use boats which ply in shallow channels on deep channels as well, but I do not think it is probable. Boats might be used on the Mississippi River of greater draft than the three that Columbus had when he discovered America. I have some figures somewhere showing the cost per ton of building a boat for deep-water navigation and for shallow-water navigation. A much cheaper boat will carry the traffic on the rivers. The model of the boats will be different. More attention will be paid to the steering gear on a river boat than on an ocean boat, and as a result transportation is so much cheaper on one of these less expensive boats that it becomes a question which is the most profitable to build, a boat that will take your freight through these canals, as the Senator says, and then out into the ocean, or to build boats that will carry the freight to the ocean side to deep water and then reload.

Mr. PERKINS. That would be much cheaper.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from California knows more about this subject than any of us. I think the great bulk of the traffic in such cases as that will be transshipped at the place where the shallower channel meets the sea.

Mr. PAGE. Is it expected that in the Mississippi River development as was just suggested by the Senator from Louisi-

ana [Mr. RANDELL], there will be a type of boats built that will take the freight from St. Louis down through the Mississippi River to New Orleans and then on down to Panama?

Mr. BURTON. A great many have said that. I have not taken what they said very seriously.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator thinks that is not practicable?

Mr. BURTON. In the first place, the model of your boat is altogether different. The method in which you maneuver the boat is very different on the river than it would be out in the Gulf. Then, again, I do not turn immediately to those figures, but my impression is that the cost of a steamer is about as 23 to 100. A boat that would stand the voyage out in the open sea must be much more solidly built than the one required in the river channel, and it is hardly profitable to build a boat which, in the first place, is much more expensive and, in the next place, can hardly be built so as to be suited for both shallow and deep water; at least, when you have the opportunity to transfer to deeper draft boats.

Mr. PAGE. The transfer costs about half a dollar a ton.

Mr. BURTON. Sometimes it costs more than that. It depends on your commodity. Everything is against the transfer, I can tell the Senator that. That is a strong statement to make, but, generally speaking, the expense of transfer has grown out of proportion to the expense of hauling. This is at least true of inland commerce, and it is one great fact that should be especially noticed in river transportation as related to railroad transportation.

Mr. PAGE. But is it not true that year by year they are managing to transfer freight from boats at a less and less sum? Fifty and sixty cents now cover the transfer of grain, coal, iron ore, and heavy material of that kind.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think we can fix that average. For instance, iron ore is loaded on Lake Superior from tipples into the boats where it would cost less than 10 cents. It is brought to a port on railroad cars and they are tipped over or put into a receptacle. It then goes down by the force of gravity into the boat. I do not suppose it costs 5 cents a ton. It all depends on your mechanism and on the materials you are handling. It would be much larger. I will say, on package freight that has to be handled carefully to protect it from breakage than it would be for handling ore and coal by transfer. Ore is about the least expensive probably to transfer.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President—

Mr. PAGE. I wish to thank the Senator for his information. It is very interesting.

Mr. BURTON. It is given extemporaneously, and it is a subject which requires very careful thought. I do not believe in the idea that boats are going to be used on rivers and then go out into the open sea. You can build a boat that will do it, and you can even find men who are venturesome enough to go out upon one that is not well constructed into the ocean with its waves and storms; but it is not a natural method for going to sea.

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL. In answer to the question of the Senator from Vermont I wish to say that a Hollander, Mr. John H. Bernhard, has recently perfected a type of boat which he thinks is going to revolutionize that trade and extend transportation on our interior rivers. I have a letter in my hand from him, dated the 18th of this month, in which he says he incloses an article from the New Orleans Item. If it does not take up too much of the Senator's time, I should like to read it.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. Bernhard says:

When the discussion of the rivers and harbors bill comes up in the Senate and you refer to this, kindly remember that this is not all, but I am getting ready to send within the next 10 or 15 days a 1,000-ton barge to Denison, Tex.—

That is away up the Red River, as the Senator probably knows, where there is very little depth to it.

And on the 1st of September a barge will leave here fully loaded with sugar for Corpus Christi, Tex., going, where possible, along the Intercoastal Canal—

I will state that the Intercoastal Canal, where it exists, is 5 feet in depth—

but considering the fact that it is not entirely complete we will have to go part of the way coastwise, suffering a great loss of time. On the 15th of September I am going to send a barge from here to Jacksonville, Fla., also coastwise. If there was only the proper system of inland waterways, why, inland navigation would be revived so much the quicker.

I merely bring this in at this time in answer to the question of the Senator from Vermont, to show that in the opinion of this gentleman, Mr. Bernhard, who is one of the brightest men

I have met, it is probably entirely feasible to load a barge on the extreme upper Mississippi, send it down the river, and then on to Panama. If he can, with the small barges which he is now building, send one out in the Gulf from New Orleans to Jacksonville, and from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, a part of the way over a 5-foot waterway in the interior, and then out into the Gulf, it surely seems to me that with a perfected channel of not less than 6 feet up to Minneapolis, and not less than 9 feet that we now have from Cairo down, he can load those barges and let them go all the way to Panama.

Of course I am no expert on this subject, and I would not pretend to express an opinion, but I thought when we had the matter before our committee—

Mr. WEST. Are those barges towed or do they travel by steam?

Mr. RANDELL. They are steel barges. He uses a propeller, I may say, rather than a stern wheel, and he uses a kind of gasoline engine.

Mr. BURTON. A Diesel engine.

Mr. RANDELL. He is very hopeful. He testified before the Committee on Commerce that he is now delivering coal in the city of New Orleans from the coal fields of Alabama, through the Warrior and Tombigbee River system in their unfinished condition, at a very much lower rate than they have ever been able to get it, so that he can sell for 75 cents per ton cheaper than it has been sold there.

Mr. PAGE. If the project of deepening the Mississippi River is carried out, what depth does the Senator anticipate when the work is completed?

Mr. RANDELL. Nine feet from Cairo to New Orleans; 8 feet between Cairo and St. Louis. The present project from St. Louis to Minneapolis and St. Paul is 6 feet.

Mr. PAGE. And from St. Louis to the Gulf how much?

Mr. RANDELL. Eight feet for 200 miles, from St. Louis to Cairo, and 9 feet for the balance of the way. There are already 9 feet, I may say, from Cairo to the Gulf. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I listened to Mr. Bernhard with a great deal of interest as an enthusiastic and very intelligent young man, but my hopes in such cases are very much dampened by experience. About every other year for the last 20 years I have listened to men possessed of equal enthusiasm, who felt sure they had some invention which would revolutionize river traffic, and in almost every case their expectations have not been realized. I really was pleased, and almost startled, I may say, by what Mr. Bernhard said in regard to the ability to carry coal from the Black Warrior River region down through the locks to Mobile Bay, and then out to the Mississippi Sound, and then by the Mississippi to New Orleans. That route, however involves no very serious difficulty, because most of the way, even in the open Gulf, it is protected by islands near at hand.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, before the Senator gets off on that line I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL]. It strikes me that the shallow-draft boats in the Gulf of Mexico, especially along about September, would encounter great difficulty with the equinoctial gales. Does the expert say that these shallow-draft boats can weather the storms that we have on the Gulf?

Mr. RANDELL. I have not gone into details. I will state to the Senator, but from my understanding of Mr. Bernhard's testimony these boats are so constructed that they will stand storms. They are entirely different from the old style of construction, and I gathered from him that in his opinion they would stand a reasonable storm; in fact, I think he said so. That is my recollection of his testimony.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smoor in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to know if these boats ever go out into the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. RANDELL. I understand so.

Mr. WHITE. They never get out into the ocean?

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. Bernhard states here that he is going to take one of the boats over to Corpus Christi, and he would have to go out into the Gulf a part of the distance, and that he was also going to take one to Jacksonville, in which event he will have to go out into the Gulf.

Mr. WHITE. I have myself seen boats ply between Tuscaloosa, Ala., and the inland.

Mr. RANDELL. Those boats do not go into the Gulf. He told us that a certain type of boat could go in the Gulf. Of course I am no expert and know nothing about it.

Mr. WHITE. In reference to these equinoctial storms, the boat would not leave port when storms are threatening.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to interrupt the Senator again if he will allow me.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Have there been constructed any inland waterways with a 12-foot channel, the depth now proposed in the new Erie Canal?

Mr. BURTON. On the Mississippi, for 320 miles to the Gulf, there is 30 feet now.

Mr. PAGE. The point I want to emphasize is this: Yankee ingenuity is equal to almost anything when it is compelled to accomplish a task. It seems to me that if we should develop a 12-foot waterway for commerce, passing down the lower Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico, which is not a very calm sea, as I understand it, is it not probable that the mind of the Yankee will eventually develop a boat that can navigate this 12-foot waterway and also navigate the ocean?

Mr. BURTON. I do not expect it. There is a wide difference between an inland waterway 12 feet deep and the open sea, a difference in the storms and winds which confront a ship. As a result of that, river ships and ocean ships are constructed on entirely different models. I am very skeptical about the success on inland waters of any single boat which carries its power within itself. In France the self-propelled boat carries, I think, less than a sixtieth part of the traffic on the rivers. I may be in error about that, but that is my recollection. It carries, however, a very small proportion, and that proportion is diminishing. River traffic is most economically conducted by barges with tugs. On the Rhine, for instance, with its splendid possibilities, the traffic is exclusively, or almost exclusively, by barges hauled by tugs. The advantage of the boat which Mr. Bernhard has devised is the very small amount of space and the limited amount of weight required for the propelling machinery, and for the fuel which is used. Just what he can accomplish by that I do not know. He seems to have accomplished some results already.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio well remembers that 40 years ago there was a very large traffic on Lake Champlain. The vessels there were floating palaces. I do not know what depth they drew, but probably not over 12 feet, because they went down through the narrows at the south.

Mr. BURTON. I do not think they drew as much as that.

Mr. PAGE. But they were large vessels.

Mr. BURTON. I will ask the Senator from Louisiana, What did the Mississippi River steamboats draw? Not more than 6 or 7 feet, did they?

Mr. RANDELL. About 7 feet, as I recall.

Mr. BURTON. And they were floating palaces.

Mr. RANDELL. When heavily loaded, they sometimes drew from 8 feet to 8½ feet, as I recall.

Mr. BURTON. They probably were not loaded heavily except under certain conditions.

Mr. PAGE. I remember very well that the freight and passenger vessels on Lake Champlain 40 years ago were quite sizable vessels, and they went down through the narrows; but after a while the railroads got control of these Champlain Transportation Co. vessels and they cut off the travel by these boats south of Ticonderoga to Whitehall, and from that day to this the narrows have been filling up. It is true, as the Senator says, that the traffic through the narrows is now only about 500,000 tons, whereas 5 or 10 years ago the traffic was over 800,000 tons.

Mr. BURTON. How is that traffic carried—by barges or by self-propelled steamers?

Mr. PAGE. It is now carried largely on the ordinary canal boat. I do not think those canal boats generally carry over 300 tons, many of them less than that, and they are hauled by tugs.

Mr. BURTON. That is the equivalent of a barge. Do they put two or three together in one tow?

Mr. PAGE. Oh, yes; half a dozen or more. It is only a few years since the large steamers on Lake Champlain went through the narrows. Their passenger business was large and the freight traffic was quite large. But for a good many years—I should say for 20 or more—large vessels have not run south of Ticonderoga. The railroads have diverted this traffic at Ticonderoga to the West Shore Railroad line south to New York. The hope now is that we shall soon have that channel again open, so that sizable boats can be put on the whole length of the lake, and, indeed, go down into the St. Lawrence River and on to Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. BURTON. There are probably two or three reasons for the railroads taking over that traffic; their discrimination and their superior organization, which are artificial advantages, and, in addition to that, there are other advantages which you may call natural—their wider area of distribution, the great increase

in cargo capacity per trainload of the railways; the traction power of the locomotive has enormously increased; the capacity of the cars has been made greater, and hence the capacity of the trainload. I should think, however, there would be a deal of traffic into the Lake Champlain region, which, if there were a 12-foot waterway up there, would be carried by water.

Mr. PAGE. The 12-foot waterway is not only assured, but it is already built from the Hudson River up to the lower end of Lake Champlain.

Mr. BURTON. Is it finished?

Mr. PAGE. It is finished now, I think, or will be finished next year.

Speaking of economic conditions, I will say that I well remember when the town of Swanton, on Lake Champlain, had a very good dock and our coal and salt came to that dock in large quantities. The railroad owned the dock, so that they were under no expense, except a very slight one to keep it in repair, and yet the dock has been abandoned, and the larger part of our coal now either comes by way of lake and rail to Burlington or comes all rail from the mines.

Mr. BURTON. It comes by rail from the mines?

Mr. PAGE. Yes; the coal from the Buffalo, Rochester, and the Pittsburgh region comes through all rail, as I understand it.

Mr. BURTON. As to that coming by way of Burlington, does it come part way by water?

Mr. PAGE. A great deal of it comes by rail, but there is some that comes by water and rail.

Mr. RANDELL. May I be permitted to read, from the testimony of Mr. John H. Bernhard before the Senate Committee on Commerce on the 26th day of March last, on the very point which the Senator from Vermont has been discussing?

Mr. GALLINGER. May I interrupt the Senator from Louisiana, to ask if he will first state who Mr. Bernhard is? I am not familiar with that name.

Mr. RANDELL. He is a Hollander, though his home, I think, now is in New Orleans. I am not sure as to that, but he gives that as his voting place, and he is there temporarily.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is he a naval constructor?

Mr. RANDELL. Yes, sir. He claims that that is his business, and that his father and his grandfather before him were in that business. Mr. Bernhard has been in this country a few years.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. Here is what he says regarding his boat:

It is 240 feet long, 32 feet wide, 8 feet deep, and drawing 6 feet of water. They are equipped with two 75-horsepower gas engines, and have a speed of 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles empty and an average of 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ when loaded. The cargo is carried on deck so that coal can be spouted quickly on the barge, unhampered by hatches, and can be unloaded quickly—the hold of the barge solely used for strengthening purposes and becoming identical to a hollow beam. We have a water-tight bulkhead on either side of the hold, closing this off from the crew's quarters and engine room; there are five lattice trusses in the hold acting the same as a bridge girder, supported on two ends. That has the great advantage that you can now place steel in the hold where you need it the most.

As to the passage in the Gulf, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] asked Mr. Bernhard this question:

Allow me to interrupt you there. You said the boats were flat bottom and had no keel. Could such boats be navigated with safety on the ocean to Panama—across the Gulf?

The very question the Senator from Vermont has asked.

Mr. BERNHARD. Allow me to answer you in a rather lengthy way as to that. The first barge was ready on the 1st of July and the insurance companies had insisted upon an insurance of 5 per cent. In some places 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is paid. I had asked them to reduce it because these barges were seaworthy, although they were designed only for inland waters, and we proved this as follows: On the 2d of July a party 20 miles above Pensacola got me on the long-distance phone. He said: "I am in a fearful fix. If by Saturday week, which is the 12th of July, 1913, I can bring my 3,000 barrels of rosin into New York, I will have delivered them before the expiration of my contract and will make a good profit on my rosin, while if they are delivered after Saturday, I will lose a considerable amount of money. I have them now on flat cars—32 flat cars." That was on the 2d of July, Tuesday. He said: "The railroad will not promise delivery Monday in New Orleans. I can not ship from Pensacola because no ship leaves. If I have them Monday morning in New Orleans I can make my money. What can you suggest?" I said: "A trial trip is going to be made very soon; either to-day or to-morrow with the first barge. I am very anxious to give her the severest test I can, because I can not go with every barge. I am willing to go through the Gulf of Mexico to Pensacola and take those 3,000 barrels of rosin." We went to that town, which was Bagdad, Fla., and arrived at 8 o'clock in the morning of July the 5th, a Saturday, and found the 32 flat cars loaded with 3,000 barrels of rosin waiting for us. It took only six hours to load the 3,000 barrels of rosin. Those 3,000 barrels of rosin were loaded on her in six hours, because we can take the sides down anywhere; we rolled the barrels from skids so fast that we needed two men to count them, and we were through at 5 o'clock in the evening. We went through the Gulf of Mexico and arrived at New Orleans the next Monday morning. If this man had taken his rosin to an express company he would not have had it delivered in time. We cut the freight rate 10 cents a barrel and made \$750 in 39 hours, making a handsome profit.

That proves beyond any doubt the safety of the barge—not being constructed for outside waters, not being constructed for Gulf service,

yet she went through the Gulf with a load for which she was not constructed.

These barges, on the 22d of October, were in the Gulf, three of them. At that time there was a 60-mile gale; two vessels in Gulfport Harbor got damaged. The Government revenue cutter had to go into Mobile for protection. Those three barges were out in the Mississippi Sound; one went for anchor and the other two fought the storm, and none got damaged. I remember the date so well because that was the date of the first trip up the Warrior River. We had been delayed, because at every step we had great difficulties to overcome. October 22 was the lowest stage of the water. All navigation had stopped because the river had on some of the bars less than 2 feet of water. We went up on this barge drawing 4 feet, but we had 2 feet of ballast, as with a draft of 4 feet the propellers were amply submerged.

We went up the river and had our troubles; but we made the trip on a river which was impossible for the smaller boats to navigate at that stage of the water level.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Ohio again?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Is it not infinitely more practicable to build a vessel able to navigate on the ocean where you can build it for a 12-foot waterway than where you are limited to a 5 or 6 or 8 foot waterway?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, I am not so sure about that. It is not merely a question of draft and size, but there is a question of handling and steering. In a river there are currents, and you have to be constantly taking pains to see that your boat is not driven against the banks. Possibly you may get into a cross current and turn right around. Thus it is necessary to have steering gear of greater relative importance on a river boat than on an ocean steamer. The ocean steamer, of course, has its steering gear, but it would be helpless in a river with a strong current; it would be constantly running into shallow water or running on the banks. Again, as I have said, the model is altogether different. Those vital differences between ocean navigation and river navigation are not removed by a difference in draft of 5 or 6 feet as compared with 12 feet. Of course, with 12 feet you could construct a larger boat, and, being larger, it would probably be more staunch.

Mr. PAGE. Would not the shallow-draft boat be a different type of boat? It would be almost a flatboat, would it not?

Mr. BURTON. The larger boat would have to have the same mechanism for steering gear and for operating in the channels and currents that would be required on the smaller boat.

Mr. PAGE. A boat does not have to be especially provided for channels and currents when it goes through the Erie Canal. There you have very calm water and the boats go through it with very little steering, as I understand.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; but even so you have to be careful to see that the boat does not go against the side of the canal.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe that in time they will provide some steering gear, perhaps from the sides of the canal, in that great waterway from Buffalo to New York that will make it practicable to run a boat through there without injury to the boat even if she had only ordinary steering gear?

Mr. BURTON. I think it is possible to construct such a boat, although the qualities of such boats would be as different as mechanism which provides for going ahead on the one hand and which provides for going sideways on the other.

Mr. PAGE. But the boat which has been described by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is almost of the flatboat type, while the boat that draws 12 feet of water can be made after the type of an ocean-going steamer.

Mr. BURTON. I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of Mr. Bernhard's efforts or his extreme hopefulness in this matter, but my judgment is influenced very much by the fact that periodically for years some one has come forward with a new style boat that was sure to accomplish wonders. I read briefly here in 1910 from a prospectus of a new line of boats on the Mississippi River, which was one of the most glowing prospectuses I had ever read, and I was interested in it because among its projectors were men who had been insistent, violent almost, and offensive against the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House because that committee did not immediately recognize the necessity of a 14-foot waterway in the Mississippi. They said they could make money and pay great dividends, and their promises were largely quoted in the Record in some remarks made by me in April, 1910. They set forth what a splendid scheme they had for carrying freight down the Mississippi River even with shallow-draft boats. Well, where is that company now?

Mr. RANDELL. I should like to ask the Senator if they actually carried any freight? Mr. Bernhard has been carrying it.

Mr. BURTON. I do not know that they ever did.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. Bernhard has a boat going up the river now.

Mr. BURTON. My experience with them was that they were a type of men with whom hope was equally as gratifying as realization, and I am not sure that they ever did put any boats on the river. They were telling what they could do.

Mr. RANDELL. I recall the company very well.

Mr. BURTON. I have before me now the figures for which I was searching, and they bring out an important point in regard to using boats both on the inland rivers and on the sea, namely, the average value of vessels per ton of carrying capacity. The figures are somewhat confusing because they are given not only for steam and sail vessels, but for unriggered vessels. The real test is the aggregate value of all, and so I will only give one set of figures, those for all vessels. These figures show what it costs per ton of freight-carrying capacity to build a boat. Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico, \$56 per ton; Pacific coast, including Alaska, \$78 per ton. I really do not know why there is the great difference between \$56 and \$78 in that instance, but I suppose because wages and materials are somewhat higher on the Pacific coast.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River, \$55 per ton. That is just a dollar less than on the Atlantic coast and the Gulf of Mexico.

On the Mississippi River and tributaries, \$5 a ton.

So that for all vessels, which no doubt takes in the different kinds of craft used for carrying freight, such as barges, the cost is eleven times as much per ton on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and eleven and one-fifth times as much per ton on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico as it is on the Mississippi River.

All other inland waters, \$18 per ton.

Anyone who is about to establish a transportation line would be confronted with those figures. They are taken from the United States census report on transportation for 1906. At the very outset it will be seen that the average cost of a floating craft required to carry a ton is eleven times as great and a little more on the Gulf of Mexico than it is on the Mississippi River; so that if one were to build a boat on the Mississippi River with a view to taking it into the Gulf, he would have to take that cost into account. That is a very prominent factor in this matter which has been so much discussed, and you will see a great deal more in the everyday newspaper than you will in the scientific journals about utilizing a boat both in inland waterways and canals and also out on the ocean. It is possible, but I do not think it is probable, that a boat will run, for instance, from St. Louis down to New Orleans and then out into the Gulf and down to Panama. The conditions in regard to the model of the boat and the water through which the boat must pass are so different in the two bodies of water that the probabilities are strongly against it.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Senator expect within the next 20 years to see an inland waterway along the border of the Atlantic that will accommodate all the coastwise traffic?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, I do not know about that; I would not wish to express an opinion at this time. There are many persons who take opposite sides on the question. I may discuss it at some time. There are certain inland waterways that I quite believe in, shallow waterways near to the coast, but far enough back so that they are central to a producing area or areas and suitable for frail craft, but, as regards attempting an inland waterway all the way from Boston around to Corpus Christi or Matamoras, I am not quite sure that I expect to see that in 20 years. I do not really believe it would be profitable.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Ohio—

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment, I should like to make one further statement. An inland waterway such as the Senator speaks about is very largely dependent on the figures which I have just given. If the boats using such a waterway were to go out into the Gulf, they would cost \$56 per ton, while if they built boats exclusively for use on inland waterways, where the water is shallow, they would not cost more than \$5 a ton of freight-carrying capacity perhaps.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator will excuse me, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. PAGE. Just one word. Does the Senator expect that such an intercoastal waterway, if that is the proper name for that kind of a waterway—

Mr. BURTON. I think intercoastal waterway is an appropriate term.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Senator think that the traffic on such a waterway would be in barges drawn by tugs, or would it be in vessels operated by their own power?

Mr. BURTON. Probably the former, in barges drawn by tugs; but such a waterway would be so different in its different parts that you can not answer that question by a general statement applicable to all its sections. For instance, there is a proposition in this bill for what is called the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal, that would make available a waterway for traffic from Baltimore to Philadelphia. There is such a waterway now. It is probable that a considerable share of that traffic will be by boats propelled by their own power. It would depend largely on the depth. If it is only 8 feet or 12 feet, or even 14 feet, naturally the larger share of the traffic will be by barges drawn by tugs, but if it gets beyond that depth a larger share would be by self-propelled vessels, that can go out into the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware Bay and even into the ocean.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. BURTON. If the Senator from Nebraska will excuse me, I promised to yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Ohio if he knows of the method of carrying lumber from Jacksonville to New York that is now employed by Mr. Cummer, who has great lumber interests in Florida? He employs what, I think, he calls scows, drawn by very heavy towboats, two or three of the scows being attached together with cables.

Mr. BURTON. That is, barges or scows.

Mr. WEST. Barges or scows; yes, sir.

Mr. BURTON. And a very heavy towboat is used to draw them?

Mr. WEST. A heavy towboat is employed to draw two or more of them. In that way he carries immense quantities of lumber from Jacksonville to New York, although the vessels have to go around Cape Hatteras, where the weather is almost always very rough; but I understand he has never lost a cargo of lumber. These scows carry about 500,000 feet of lumber to the scow.

Mr. BURTON. Which would weigh, dependent on the kind of lumber and the degree to which it was seasoned, say 1,250 tons.

Mr. WEST. The lumber carried is green lumber, and I think 500,000 feet would weigh 2,500,000 pounds.

Mr. BURTON. That makes 1,250 tons, just as I estimated. I was not aware that was being done. I take it that is a species of navigation very similar to rafting. Are not the scows low and near to the water, not having much freeboard?

Mr. WEST. Yes, sir; they are built for capacity, for holding lumber. They have a way of fastening the lumber on so that it is not lost. I think on some trips the cables have broken a few times, but they have never lost a cargo.

Mr. BURTON. They do not bring back a return cargo, I am quite sure.

Mr. RANDELL. What do they draw?

Mr. WEST. I do not know, but they are shallow-draft craft.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator does not know their draft.

Mr. WEST. No, sir; but they are shallow.

Mr. BURTON. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that what he describes is closely related to the rafting of logs. The main thing to be accomplished is to securely tie the lumber so that it will not get loose. If they can do that, they might carry a quantity of lumber in a manner even more convenient than the rafting of logs. I do not look upon that as creating any exception to the general rules in regard to traffic itself. It is itself an exception of course.

Mr. WEST. I will say to the Senator that I know of nobody else who is engaged in this business except Mr. Cummer, who operates a very large mill. This was an experiment when they went into it, but it has proven very successful.

Mr. BURTON. What I should fear, of course, in any such attempt as that would be that they would meet some frightful storm that would either break the scows loose from the tug or wreck them.

Mr. WEST. Yes. I will say that they have been in terrific storms, and they have broken loose, but they have never lost a scow.

Mr. BURTON. With that kind of a load, even if the scow did get loose, if the lumber was properly fastened together, it would probably float without destruction. They could recover it. Of course, there are some varieties of lumber of such a weight that they might sink if cut loose in the water.

Mr. LANE. They lash it down. I have been on such craft where they loaded them to the sinking point and lashed the lumber down in order to get a better grip on the tide.

Mr. BURTON. Do they carry lumber in any way like that out on the Pacific coast?

Mr. LANE. Only in the bays.

Mr. BURTON. They do not carry it out to sea, do they?

Mr. LANE. No. They transport it in those large rafts of logs.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	James	Perkins	Stone
Brady	Jones	Polindexter	Swanson
Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Thomas
Burton	Lane	Shafroth	Thompson
Camden	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Thornton
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Vardaman
Chilton	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	West
Clapp	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	White
Clarke, Ark.	Norris	Smith, Md.	Works
Gronna	Overman	Smith, Mich.	
Hollis	Page	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. RANDELL entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. STERLING and Mr. TILLMAN answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a standing order to that effect. It has never been vacated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, pending that I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. KERN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senate adjourn.

The Senate refused to adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. SAULSBURY, and Mr. REED entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I had practically finished my remarks upon New York Harbor.

The next harbor in order of importance, judged by the tonnage, is that of Duluth-Superior, which has a tonnage of 41,474,776 tons and has been improved at a cost of \$7,692,213.60. This includes \$574,000 expended upon Duluth Harbor prior to the consolidation of the two projects on June 3, 1896, and \$695,000 expended prior to that date on Superior Harbor. It will be seen that this, the second harbor in the United States in the magnitude of its traffic, has been improved at comparatively small cost—a little less than \$8,000,000.

The next harbor in point of traffic is that of Philadelphia, including the channel to the sea, which is about 101 miles long, according to the official figures. In 1912 this harbor had a traffic of 26,267,335 tons, including 4,685,234 tons carried on car floats between Philadelphia and Camden. I think it hardly fair to include this latter amount, so deducting it the aggregate traffic of the harbor, including the channel to the sea, would be about 21,600,000 tons. It is fair to include the channel to the sea, at least so far as regards boats which ply to and from Philadelphia. The main object of the improvement of that river is to afford access to the port of Philadelphia; and of the expense incurred all but \$3,950,000 was for the improvement of the river below Philadelphia. That makes the cost of the river below Philadelphia about \$15,000,000.

This very important harbor, the third in the United States, with the means of access to it, has been improved at very great expense, because of the troublesome channels and currents in the Delaware River. One feature of those currents is that the tide does not always flow back to the sea upon the same lines upon which it moves forward on the ebb toward Philadelphia, and a great deal of silt is deposited in the channel on the upward flow of the tide which is not removed by the ebb.

The depth of the channel leading to New York Harbor and in Hudson River around in the neighborhood of the city is 40 feet at low tide. In the Philadelphia channel it is at present 30 feet, but there is a project well under way for increasing that depth to 35 feet. The additional cost of this is estimated at

\$6,800,200. In many respects a harbor so located must labor under disadvantages as compared with one nearer to the sea and approached by a bay. The harbor of Philadelphia is in many respects very similar to that of the city of London and to that of the city of Hamburg.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio is willing to suspend for a short time his very interesting and instructive address, I should like to make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BURTON. I am willing to suspend for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will it be agreeable to the Senator to go back into legislative session, in order that the Senator may finish his speech?

Mr. BURTON. Either way is entirely satisfactory to me. I shall be glad to yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13811) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bryan	Lane	Pomerene	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Sterling
Camden	Martin, Va.	Reed	Stone
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Swanson
Clapp	Nelson	Sheppard	Thomas
Hollis	Norris	Simmons	Thornton
James	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	West
Kern	Page	Smith, Ga.	White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21, 1914.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James P. Bole, of Bozeman, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Bozeman, Mont., vice Walter H. Sales, term expired.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 16, 1914.

Lester Julian Efrd, of Florida.

Maurice Eby Heck, of Florida.

Charles Henry Hecker, of Missouri.

Adolphus Knopf, of New York.

Robert John McAdory, of California.

Richard Weil, of New York.

Justus Marchal Wheate, of Idaho.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Harris Laning to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Lieut. Wallace Berthoff to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 5th day of March, 1914.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Chester H. J. Keppler to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th day of April, 1914.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914:

Robert S. Roberston, jr., and

Raleigh C. Williams.

Ensign Harry A. Badt to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1913.

Medical Inspector Edward R. Stitt to be a medical director in the Navy from the 20th day of November, 1913.

Surg. Charles M. DeValin to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 25th day of June, 1914.

Passed Asst. Surg. Allen D. McLean to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 18th day of June, 1914.

Midshipman Stuart D. Truesdell to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1914.

William B. Brinsmade, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 13th day of July, 1914.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21, 1914.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

John H. Clarke to be United States district judge, northern district of Ohio.

W. H. Seward Thomson to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

Jared Y. Sanders to be naval officer of customs in the district of New Orleans.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert L. Knox to be surveyor of customs in the district of New Orleans.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Bat P. Sullivan to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans.

POSTMASTERS.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William F. Murray, Boston.

NEW YORK.

Daniel E. Harrington, Saratoga Springs.

John H. Mara, Beacon (late Fishkill on the Hudson).

OHIO.

Samuel D. Hensel, Continental.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

A. J. Littig, Flandreau.

Lenora Pardy, Colman.

WISCONSIN.

C. A. Hoen, Edgerton.

Andrew P. Kealy, Hudson.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate July 21, 1914.

C. Rettenmaier to be postmaster at Albany, Minn.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1914.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, Almighty and ever-blessed God, our heavenly Father, at the beginning of a new congressional day, to commend our souls to Thy care and keeping, that we enter not into temptation, that we may fulfill the obligations resting upon us conscientiously, in accordance with our highest conceptions of right and duty; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENLARGED HOMESTEADS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed the bill (H. R. 12919) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for enlarged homesteads," with a slight typographical error in it, and I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill was engrossed and passed, so as to return to the amending stage for the purpose of offering a slight amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the House vacate the proceedings as to the bill H. R. 12919 back to the amendment stage, in order to correct a typographical error. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 12919, Page 3, line 23, strike out the word "proofs" and insert in lieu thereof the word "proof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I arise to a question of the highest personal privilege. On the 29th of June, 1913, there appeared simultaneously in the New York World and the Chicago Tribune an article signed by Martin M. Mulhall, a former employee of the National Association of Manufacturers, containing certain charges against me. On July 9, 1913, I arose in my place on this floor, and calling attention to the article in question, I denounced it as outrageous and untrue, and asserted that I had never received a cent from anybody belonging to the National Association of Manufacturers. I also stated that I was ready to go before any committee at any time that might be selected to investigate the charges contained in the Mulhall articles. Afterwards a resolution of investigation was passed. A select committee was appointed and an exhaustive and long drawn-out investigation was made, the result being that the committee found all the substantial charges against myself to be false and without foundation. The investigation disclosed the fact that on all occasions I voted in this House in compliance with promises and pledges I made my constituents; at all times, whenever occasion presented itself, voting for the measures coming before Congress advocated by organized labor. Unfortunately, I came to this House a poor man; fortunately, however, for myself, taking into consideration the character of the charges made against me, I leave this House a poor man. I have been compelled during my service as a Member of this House to borrow money. I have not been in a position to go to banks and to tender to them the security they require. I have been compelled to borrow from my friends. It so happened that afterwards persons from whom I borrowed money became the opponents of certain legislation which passed this House affecting their business as pawnbrokers and as liquor dealers. In the matter of the pawnbrokers bill I voted also according to the suggestion of a great labor organization here—the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia. On account of these loans I have been censured by this committee. The committee in their findings, after reviewing carefully all the evidence presented against me, said, with reference to these money lenders and liquor dealers:

There is no evidence that such lobbies as were maintained by these effected or prevented legislation, improperly or otherwise.

However, with reference to these transactions, the committee hold that I have been guilty of acts of impropriety. In their report the committee state:

The Members of the House know Mr. McDERMOTT; know his ideals and his characteristics as the public generally does not know, and in the nature of things can not know them. His training and associations have not given him the ethical perceptions and standards relative to public office that usually characterize public men. We can not say that he has been corrupted in his votes.

It is true that I have not had the educational training and, perhaps, the social training and advantages that other Members of this House may boast or may have had. I have been invited to many places in Chicago and elsewhere that, perhaps, some Members may think above my social station; but I have preferred to associate with the people who have sent me to Congress, and when I am at home in Chicago I am to be found at my accustomed haunts and among my old companions, associating with the men and boys in the great Union Stockyards, the people I love and want to associate with. My training has been with them for over 20 years. I admire them and love them. They are open and above board. If they fight you, they fight you on the square; if they are against you, they come to you, face to face, and manfully tell you that they are against you, but they do not use the brigand methods of shooting at you from ambush. I never cast a vote that these honest, home-loving people criticized me for. I go back to them, and am willing and glad to do so. They will believe me, because they know I never lied to them; that I have always been their loyal friend and servant.

The committee action I have been discussing is the action of the select committee appointed to investigate the charges against me. Their report and the evidence presented before them was afterwards submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, with directions to report a proper course of procedure, and that committee has presented to this House their report, finding that I have been guilty of acts of impropriety and recommending that I be censured.

I have many warm friends in this House. Their elections are approaching. I do not desire to embarrass them in any way. I am conscious of no wrongdoing as a Member of this body. My only offense is that I have borrowed money. A

censure by this House would carry with it a strong criticism of my friends and associates in my district—the findings of the select committee being that my associations have not given me the ethical perceptions and standards which ought to characterize men in public life.

I have the highest respect for my constituency. I do not intend that in this House the character and standing of my friends and the people I represent shall be either discussed or questioned in any manner. After all, the court of last resort in a matter of this kind is the constituency of the Member affected by such charges as these.

Inasmuch as the findings of fact made by the select committee are all in my favor, I consider myself fully vindicated. I feel that under the facts in this case the question of my censure ought not to be submitted to this House; but I am quite willing that it be now submitted to my constituents, and from the decision of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House I desire to appeal to my constituents. I have forwarded my resignation as a Member of this Congress from the fourth district of Illinois to the governor of my State, and I now here tender my resignation to the Speaker of this House and send to the Speaker's desk a copy of my communication to the governor. I go now from this Hall to my constituents for the purpose of appealing to them for the vindication to which I feel I am of right entitled. I have submitted my name to the voters of my district as a candidate for reelection to the Congress of the United States. I am willing to abide by their decision.

I ask that the letter containing my resignation, addressed to the Speaker of the House, be read, together with the copy of the telegram sent by me to the governor of the State of Illinois. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication. The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 21, 1914.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day tendered my resignation as a Representative in Congress from the fourth congressional district of Illinois to Hon. Edward F. Dunne, governor of the State of Illinois, to take effect immediately. I attach hereto a copy of my resignation so forwarded to the governor.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,

JAMES T. McDERMOTT,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Illinois.

JULY 21, 1914.

Hon. E. F. DUNNE,
Governor of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

I hereby tender my resignation as Representative in Congress from the fourth congressional district of Illinois, to take effect immediately.

JAMES T. McDERMOTT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this communication, I take it, which is a formal notice, should be placed on file?

The SPEAKER. It should be placed on file. The House does not have to pass on it. It can not accept the resignation of a Member.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15320. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to disregard section 33 of the public-buildings act of March 4, 1913, as to site at Owego, N. Y.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 11317. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Newcastle, Ind.; and

H. R. 1694. An act to amend an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to set apart certain tracts of land in the State of California as forest reservations."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On July 7, 1914:

H. R. 13153. An act for the relief of Pete Jelovac.

On July 9, 1914:

H. R. 4938. An act providing for the issuance of patents to transferees of town lots purchased from the United States at public sale in certain cases; and

H. R. 16192. An act to authorize the issuance of patent to Rachel E. Dangerfield Boast for the southeast quarter of sec-

tion 21 and the northeast quarter of section 23, township 1 south, range 57 west of the sixth principal meridian.

On July 11, 1914:

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved May 2, 1914.

On July 16, 1914:

H. R. 15279. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to continue the provisions of a joint resolution approved June 30, 1914, entitled "Joint resolution extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government and of the District of Columbia under certain contingencies."

On July 17, 1914:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Wichita, Kans., October 7 to 17, inclusive, 1914;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Mrs. Andrew Riganopolous;

H. R. 1138. An act for the relief of Helen Wakefield;

H. R. 1291. An act for the relief of George Gardells;

H. R. 2407. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Engineering Co., of the city of Philadelphia;

H. R. 2536. An act for the relief of John Streckfus;

H. R. 2540. An act for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased;

H. R. 3041. An act to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell;

H. R. 3988. An act for the purchase of a building and a lot as a mine-rescue station at McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 4744. An act to authorize the appointment of John W. Hyatt to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army;

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Mary Abel;

H. R. 5746. An act for the relief of Marcus L. Pelham;

H. R. 5884. An act granting to the people of the State of California the right of way upon and across the United States fish reservation at Baird, Shasta County, Cal.;

H. R. 6220. An act for the relief of Hosea Stone;

H. R. 7298. An act to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Smyrna, Del.;

H. R. 7327. An act for the relief of Charles L. Hill;

H. R. 7484. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Morrow;

H. R. 8893. An act for the relief of Mary E. Goodley;

H. R. 9042. An act to permit sales by supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges;

H. R. 9147. An act to restore First Lieut. James P. Barney, retired, to the active list of the Army;

H. R. 9421. An act for the relief of John T. Glynn;

H. R. 10345. An act for the relief of C. M. Hammond;

H. R. 11254. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States post-office building at Mandan, N. Dak.;

H. R. 11625. An act to increase the appropriation for the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 11747. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction of a public building in Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 12191. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased;

H. R. 12778. An act for the relief of W. D. Stoyer, administrator of the estate of Henry S. Stoyer;

H. R. 13819. An act to increase the limit of cost of Federal building at Pendleton, Ore.;

H. R. 14229. An act for the relief of Henry La Roque;

H. R. 14684. An act for the relief of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

H. R. 14925. An act for the retirement of H. R. Drake;

H. R. 16055. An act to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 1580. An act for the relief of John R. Norris;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of William P. Havenor;

H. R. 6260. An act for the relief of Hyacinthe Villeneuve;

H. R. 6464. An act for the relief of Charles R. Grant;

H. R. 6831. An act to quiet title to lot 5, section 33, township 14, range 18 east, Noxubee County, Miss.;

H. R. 10767. An act for the relief of John D. Baldwin; and

H. R. 13985. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution authorizing the President to appoint a member of the New Jersey and New York Joint Harbor Line Commission; and

S. 4714. An act to authorize Louis Eder to enter lands under the homestead laws.

On July 18, 1914:

H. R. 5304. An act to increase the efficiency of the aviation service of the Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9770. An act to levy and collect an income tax on railroads in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11381. An act for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased;

H. R. 1517. An act for the relief of George W. Cary; and

H. R. 6014. An act for the relief of Serapio Romero, late postmaster at Las Vegas, N. Mex.

On July 21, 1914:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain saddles and bridles for the use of the national encampment, Knights of Pythias, to be held at Terre Haute, Ind., in July, 1914;

H. R. 10523. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12914. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 13542. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 14234. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 14738. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 15692. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 13297. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 13920. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 14546. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 15071. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 15504. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 17041, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 984).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17041) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 10, 12, 22, 27, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 52, 54, 64, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83, 87, 88, 90, 93, 95, 101, 102, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 133, 134, 136, 143, 144, 147, 153, 158, 160, 161, and 162.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 41, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 70, 78, 82, 84, 85, 86, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 119, 121, 127, 131, 132, 135, 139, 140, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, and 159, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Jellico, Tenn., post office: For commencement, \$40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Norton, Va., post office: For site and commencement, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Prescott, Ariz., post office: For site, \$7,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sylacauga, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out, in lines 6 and 7 of said amendment, the following words: "without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 7 of the bill, after line 20, the following:

"Fairbanks, Alaska: For the purchase, at a price not in excess of \$15,000, of that portion of the block whereon the United States courthouse and jail now stand, in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, not now owned by the United States, \$15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 1 of the bill, after line 15, the following:

"Albertville, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 2 of the bill, after line 11, the following:

"Attalla, Ala., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 2 of the bill, after line 24, the following:

"Beaufort, S. C., post office and customhouse: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 6 of the bill, after line 18, the following:

"Decatur, Ala., post office: For site, \$6,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the

matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 9 of the bill, after line 4, the following:

"Glenwood, Iowa, post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 11 of the bill, after line 3, the following:

"Lancaster, Pa., post office: For site, \$138,278.78."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 11 of the bill, after line 5, the following:

"Lenoir, N. C., post office: For site, \$7,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, on page 16 of the bill, after line 8, the following:

"Rossville, Ga., post office: For site, \$5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$445,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "; and authority is hereby given to contract for the construction of said revenue cutters within the limit of cost heretofore fixed for each of them"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$679,853"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$502,606"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,942,964"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,266.67"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$340,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,305,520"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the salaries of judges retired under section 714 of the Revised Statutes, and the judges, officials, and employees of all courts whose sessions are held in the District of Columbia, whose salaries shall be paid through the disbursing officer of the Department of Justice as hitherto provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"All acts and parts of acts authorizing the clerks of the United States district courts in and for the States of Oregon, Montana, and Washington, respectively, to charge and collect double the fees provided in section 828 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all acts authorizing United States marshals in and for said States, respectively, to receive and collect double the fees provided by section 829 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, are hereby repealed, to take effect from and after January 1, 1915: *Provided*, That no clerk of the United States district courts in and for said States shall be allowed by the Attorney General to retain of the fees and emoluments of his office, for his personal compensation, over and above his necessary office expenses, including the necessary clerk hire, to be audited and allowed by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, a sum exceeding \$3,500 per year, to take effect from and after January 1, 1915: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall operate to reduce the fees that the clerks of the United States district courts and United States marshals in any States other than those mentioned herein have heretofore been authorized to charge and collect."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$204,420"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Alaska Fishery Service, vessels and boats: For construction or purchase of vessels and boats in connection with the enforce-

ment of the laws and regulations for the protection of the fisheries and fur-bearing animals of Alaska, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment omit the following: "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment omit the following: "to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"MACDONOUGH MEMORIAL.

"For the erection of memorials at or near Plattsburg, N. Y., in commemoration of the victory of Commodore Thomas Macdonough on Lake Champlain, in September, 1814, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Secretary of War and commissions to be appointed by the States of Vermont and New York, respectively, to be expended by the Secretary of War, \$15,000 toward the memorial of the State of Vermont and \$125,000 toward the memorial of the State of New York; in all, \$140,000. *Provided*, That no part of the said appropriation shall be paid out of the Treasury until after the State of New York shall have appropriated a sum not less than \$125,000 for its said memorial and celebration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 9, 10, and 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: " : *Provided*, That the work herein authorized shall be completed on or before January 1, 1915 "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 44, 45, 91, 92, 138, 145, and 146.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
SWAGAR SHERLEY,
FREDK. H. GILLET,
Managers on the part of the House.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
GEO. C. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17041) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, relating to public buildings, marine hospitals, and quarantine stations: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

Fort Stanton, N. Mex., sanatorium, \$300.

Jellico, Tenn., post office, \$40,000.

New Haven, Conn., post office, makes appropriations heretofore or hereafter made available for mail-handling devices.

Norton, Va., post office, \$50,000.

Prescott, Ariz., post office, \$7,500.

Sylacauga, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Washington, D. C., national archives building, \$5,000, and strikes out authority to employ technical and engineering services without reference to civil-service rules and regulations.

Albertville, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Attalla, Ala., post office, \$5,000.

Beaufort, S. C., post office, \$5,000.

Decatur, Ala., post office, \$6,500.

Glenwood, Iowa, post office, \$5,000.

Lancaster, Pa., post office, \$138,278.78.

Lenoir, N. C., post office, \$7,000.

Rossville, Ga., post office, \$5,000.

San Francisco, Cal., marine hospital, \$5,000.

San Juan, P. R., quarantine station, enlarges the authority for the erection of buildings within the limit of cost.

New Orleans, La., quarantine station, \$12,000.

Cape Fear, N. C., quarantine station, \$25,000.

Strikes out items proposed by the Senate as follows:

Philadelphia, Pa., Mint, \$10,000.

Washington, D. C., Treasury Building, \$8,000.

Washington, D. C., Winder Building, \$3,500.

Honolulu, Hawaii, quarantine station, \$22,000.

On amendments Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, relating to current expenses of public buildings: Inserts authority for the disposal of the wharf and warehouse at Sitka, Alaska, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out authority increasing the amount to be used for repair of the Treasury, Butler, and Winder Buildings from \$14,000 to \$18,000; appropriates \$725,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$749,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs and preservation of public buildings; strikes out authority increasing the amount to be used for mechanical equipment for the Treasury, Butler, and Winder Buildings from \$10,000 to \$14,500; appropriates \$445,000 instead of \$453,500, as proposed by the Senate, and \$440,000, as proposed by the House, for mechanical equipment; reappropriates the unexpended balance of a former appropriation for compensation and expenses of site agents; appropriates \$2,650,000 instead of \$2,600,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operating force; appropriates \$850,000 instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the House, and \$900,000, as proposed by the Senate, for furniture and repairs of furniture; and strikes out the increase, proposed by the Senate, of \$25,000 in the amount for operating supplies.

On amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$2,100,000 instead of \$2,025,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,226,050, as proposed by the Senate, for pay of crews of surfmen and miscellaneous expenses of the Life-Saving Service.

On amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$165,000, as proposed by the Senate, toward the construction of two new revenue cutters authorized by the act of June 24, 1914, and authorizes contracts to be entered into for the construction of such revenue cutters within their authorized limit of cost.

On amendments Nos. 37, 38, and 39: Appropriates for expenses of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the sums proposed by the House instead of the increased amounts proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$175,000 instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for punishing violations of internal-revenue laws.

On amendments Nos. 41, 42, and 43: Increases the compensation of two employees in custody of dies, rolls, and plates in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing from \$1,800 to \$2,000 and from \$1,200 to \$1,400, respectively.

On amendments Nos. 46, 47, 48, and 49, relating to the Public Health Service: Appropriates \$679,858 instead of \$629,858, as proposed by the House, and \$729,858, as proposed by the Senate, for commissioned medical officers and pharmacists; appropriates \$502,606 instead of \$477,606, as proposed by the House, and \$527,606, as proposed by the Senate, for pay of attendants and other employees; and appropriates \$256,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$245,000, as proposed by the House, for maintenance of marine hospitals.

On amendment No. 50: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, relating to the condemnation of small park areas at intersections of streets in the District of Columbia.

On amendment No. 51: Inserts the provision proposed by the Senate instead of the one in the bill as passed by the House relating to the duty of common carriers in transporting engineers and other employees engaged in making the physical valuation of the property of common carriers.

On amendment No. 52: Strikes out the appropriation proposed by the Senate for collecting the military records of the Revolutionary War.

On amendments Nos. 53, 54, and 55: Makes the appropriation for the extension of the artillery-ammunition storehouse at the Frankford Arsenal available for additional facilities for storing artillery ammunition and strikes out the appropriation of \$135,000, proposed by the Senate, for additional ground at that arsenal.

On amendment No. 56: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, requiring the assignment of proper rooms for post-office purposes at military posts.

On amendments Nos. 57, 58, and 59: Fixes the compensation of two engineers at Fort Monroe, Va., at \$1,000 each, instead of \$900 each, as proposed by the House, and \$1,200, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 60: Continues the availability of the \$350 heretofore appropriated for purchase of land at Fort Washington, Md., during the fiscal year 1915.

On amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$1,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of the Dunkard Church property on the Antietam battle field.

On amendment No. 62: Appropriates \$250, as proposed by the Senate, for the care, protection, and maintenance of the Confederate Stockade Cemetery, Johnstons Island, in Sandusky Bay.

On amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$11,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the road from the Highway Bridge to Arlington National Cemetery.

On amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Appropriates \$125,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance and improvements in Yellowstone National Park, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, for widening certain roads in the park.

On amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for widening roads and for bridges and culverts in the forest reserves leading into Yellowstone Park.

On amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$85,000 instead of \$75,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Crater Lake National Park.

On amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for retaining walls in Meridian Hill Park.

On amendment No. 69: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$7,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the Commission of Fine Arts.

On amendment No. 70: Extends the survey of northern and northwestern lakes to the Lake of the Woods and other boundary and connecting waters between said lake and Lake Superior.

On amendments Nos. 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75, relating to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: Strikes out the appropriations, proposed by the Senate, of \$22,000 for sea wall at Johns Creek at the Southern Branch and \$17,000 for repair of barracks at the Pacific Branch.

On amendment No. 76: Strikes out the appropriation of \$5,229.50, proposed by the Senate, for pay of certain employees of the Senate.

On amendment No. 77: Strikes out the appropriation of \$7,000 for collecting the naval records of the Revolutionary War.

On amendment No. 78: Provides for a vehicle for the office of the Superintendent of the Capitol.

On amendment No. 79: Strikes out the appropriation of \$5,000, proposed by the Senate, for the protection of national monuments.

On amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$340,000, instead of \$330,000, as proposed by the House, and \$350,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of land offices.

On amendment No. 81: Appropriates \$475,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for protecting public lands.

On amendment No. 82: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for protecting lands involved in the Oregon & California Railroad forfeiture suit.

On amendment No. 83: Strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000, proposed by the Senate, to enable the Agricultural Department to make experimental demonstrations for utilizing by-products of trees.

On amendment No. 84: Authorizes the use of \$25,000 of the appropriation for protecting public lands to bring up arrears of work in the surveyors general's offices.

On amendments Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, and 89, relating to the Geological Survey: Authorizes the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles; strikes out the provision confining the geologic surveys to the public lands; appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for gauging streams; strikes out the provision to enable the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the existence of artesian water and other underground water for irrigation of arid and semiarid regions by boring wells.

On amendment No. 90: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for medical relief in Alaska.

On amendment No. 93: Strikes out the appropriation of \$12,500, proposed by the Senate, for survey of a road in Mount Rainier National Park.

On amendment No. 94: Appropriates \$8,040, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$7,540, as proposed by the House, for Crater Lake National Park.

On amendment No. 95: Strikes out the appropriation of \$1,500 for Sullys Hill National Park.

On amendment No. 96: Strikes out the authority, proposed by the House, to expend \$20,000 for remodeling Government free bathhouses at the Hot Springs Reservation.

On amendments Nos. 97 and 98: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the House, for improving grounds and repairing buildings of Howard University.

On amendment No. 99: Authorizes the purchase of an ambulance out of the maintenance appropriation of Freedmen's Hospital.

On amendment No. 100: Directs the transfer of \$37,996.70, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$41,209.73, as proposed by the House, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the Treasury of the United States on account of Freedmen's Hospital.

On amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Appropriates \$35,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for special attorneys and counselors at law in customs cases.

On amendment No. 103: Appropriates \$17,000 instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the House, and \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, for defending suits in claims against the United States.

On amendment No. 104: Appropriates \$485,000 instead of \$480,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for detection and prosecution of crimes.

On amendment No. 105: Authorizes the expenditure of \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the House, out of the appropriation for the enforcement of anti-trust laws for necessary employees at Washington, D. C.

On amendments Nos. 106 and 107: Makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill and provides for the payment of justices of the Supreme Court and judges of other courts in Washington and retired judges through the disbursing officer of the Department of Justice.

On amendment No. 108: Appropriates \$615,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$600,000, as proposed by the House, for United States district attorneys.

On amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$350,000 instead of \$325,000, as proposed by the House, and \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, for regular assistants to United States district attorneys.

On amendment No. 110: Inserts a provision preventing the payment of double fees to the clerks of courts and United States marshals in Oregon, Washington, and Montana, and provides for them the same compensation as is paid to similar officers in other States.

On amendment No. 111: Appropriates \$558,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses of United States courts.

On amendments Nos. 112, 113, and 114: Increases the pay of the farmer at the Atlanta Penitentiary from \$900 to \$1,200.

On amendments Nos. 115, 116, and 117: Strikes out the proposed increase in the compensation of the tailor at the National Training School for Boys.

On amendment No. 118: Strikes out the appropriation of \$80,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Pointe Vincent Light Station, Cal.

On amendment No. 119: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for changing lighting and providing additional lighting at the eastern and western entrances at Cape Cod Canal.

On amendments Nos. 120 and 121: Appropriates \$997,600, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,038,000, as proposed by the Senate, for officers and crews of lighthouse vessels and tenders and inserts a provision granting 15 days' leave of absence with pay each year to employees of the Lighthouse Service.

On amendments Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, and 132, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Appropriates \$165,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for surveys and resurveys of coasts on the Pacific Ocean; strikes out authority to reimburse officers for expenses of extending relief in certain cases; strikes out the appropriation, proposed by the Senate, of \$175,000 for two new vessels; provides for an additional clerk at \$1,800 in the office force; strikes out provision for an additional clerk at \$1,000; strikes out the appropriation of \$18,600, proposed by the Senate, for a lithographic press; appropriates \$7,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,400, as proposed by the House, for the lithographic building; and appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$4,000, as proposed by the House, for a one-story building between the present buildings of the survey.

On amendments Nos. 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, and 142, relating to the Bureau of Fisheries: Strikes out the provi-

sion, proposed by the Senate, for a fish pathologist at \$2,500; inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, with reference to the operations of the Bureau of Fisheries in States where there are not adequate laws for the protection of fish; appropriates \$80,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Alaska general service; appropriates \$50,000 instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for vessels and boats for the Alaskan fishery service; authorizes any corporation, firm, or individual in Florida to donate land and water rights for the marine biological station in Florida; appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Clackamas, Oreg., fish station; appropriates \$5,000 and \$3,500, respectively, as proposed by the Senate, for the biological station at Beaufort, N. C.

On amendments Nos. 143 and 144: Appropriates \$2,649,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of regulating immigration, and restores to the bill the provision, stricken out by the Senate, fixing the salary of the commissioner of immigration at New Orleans at \$2,900.

On amendment No. 147: Strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for an Alaskan exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

On amendment No. 148: Appropriates \$55,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the exposition to celebrate the anniversary of the emancipation of the negro.

On amendment No. 149: Appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Macdonough Memorial.

On amendment No. 150: Appropriates \$5,956, as proposed by the Senate, for the International Council for Exploration of the Sea.

On amendment No. 151: Authorizes the purchase of a power lawn mower for the Botanic Garden.

On amendment No. 152: Reappropriates for the fiscal year 1915 the appropriation of \$2,500 heretofore made for the removal of the fence around Botanic Garden.

On amendments Nos. 153, 154, 155, and 156: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$55,000 for the expenses of the Senate Office Building, \$5,000 for furniture for that building, \$17,500 for repairs and improvements to the Senate kitchen and restaurant; and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, concerning the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for transportation facilities in the subways of the Capitol to the Senate and House Office Buildings.

On amendment No. 158: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, excepting the reports of the Attorney General from the general provision relating to the time of submitting annual reports.

On amendment No. 159: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, requiring that the lowest prices paid for typewriters during the fiscal years 1913 and 1914 shall not be exceeded during the fiscal year 1915 shall apply to "substantially" the same model of machine.

On amendments Nos. 160 and 161: Limits the amount that may be prescribed for per diem rates of allowance to persons traveling on official business to \$4, as proposed by the House, instead of \$6, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, granting allowances of \$8 per day to the Board of Mediation and Conciliation and General Appraisers.

On amendment No. 162: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, regulating the compensation and per diem allowances of internal-revenue agents.

On amendment No. 163: On the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate: Accepts the verbal modification proposed in the appropriation of \$200,000 for the relief of sufferers by fire at Salem, Mass.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on amendments of the Senate as follows:

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Establishing customs collection districts at Kansas City, Mo., and Tampa, Fla.

Amendment No. 91: Appropriating \$237,840 for the Hot Springs Reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.

Amendment No. 92: Increasing the appropriation for Glacier National Park from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

Amendment No. 138: Appropriating \$25,000 for the fish-cultural station in Utah.

Amendment No. 145: Appropriating \$500,000 for the Government building at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Amendment No. 146: Amending the law prescribing the Government exhibit to be made at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
SWAGAR SHERLEY,
FREDK. H. GILLET,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that in the statement there is an error as to what had been done with amendment No. 149. The statement recites that the amendment appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Macdonough memorial. That is an error in the printing. The agreement was for \$140,000 instead of \$250,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. On amendment No. 36, which made a preliminary appropriation for the construction of two revenue cutters recently authorized by law I see that the conferees have inserted as an addition to the appropriation:

And authority is hereby given to contract for the construction of said revenue cutters within the limit of cost heretofore fixed for each of them.

At whose instance was this added?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The conferees did it.

Mr. MANN. Possibly the conferees were not familiar with the law that was passed, because that itself is an authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The statement was made that there was some question whether authority existed to contract for their construction under the wording of that act.

Mr. MANN. In consideration of the fact that since the gentleman from New York and I have been Members of the House there have probably been passed 40 or 50 such acts under which contracts have been let, I wondered why they discovered the necessity for inserting this.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was easier to do this than to listen to arguments.

Mr. MANN. It does not do any harm, but it is entirely useless.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was a hot night, and very late, and sooner than suffer any longer we inserted the matter, because it did no harm.

Mr. MANN. I do not want the gentleman to think it necessary when we pass one of these acts in reference to the Light-house Service or the Revenue-Cutter Service, or any other service, authorizing the Secretary to acquire such and such property, that we authorize the contract to be let subject to the appropriations to be made.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will permit, then I suggest if the insertion of this language be necessary, hereafter when we make authorizations we must add that the proper department is thereby authorized to contract within this limit.

Mr. MANN. That would be necessary if this were necessary, but we have always treated it the other way, and they have let the contracts without difficulty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee as to the striking out of the \$50,000 provision for the Alaskan exhibit at the San Francisco exposition. Is there any provision made anywhere for an appropriation for showing the Alaskan exhibit at the exposition in San Francisco?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is none made by the United States Government. What Alaska has done I am unable to state.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is that a complete report?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 44, 45, 91, 92, 138, 145, and 146.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to certain amendments, the numbers of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments Nos. 44, 45, 91, 92, 138—

Mr. MANN. Please stop the reading there. Let it go down to there, and there will be another motion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I move to further insist on amendments 41, 42, 44, 71, 92, and 98.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. On any one of those amendments?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes, sir; No. 91.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I modify the motion so that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 44, 45, 92, and 138.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House further insist upon its disagree-

ment to Senate amendments 44, 45, 92, and 138. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 91.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 91. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 91: On page 115 of the printed bill insert the following:

"Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.: For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs to care for storm waters from the mountains of the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with plans described in House Document No. 1298, Sixty-second Congress, third session."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield 10 minutes now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment upon which I shall insist is No. 91, page 115, House bill 7041, and which reads as follows:

"Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.: For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs to care for storm waters from the mountains of the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with plans described in House Document No. 1298, Sixty-second Congress, third session."

The hot springs referred to in the amendment are located on a Government reservation embracing between 900 and 1,000 acres of land.

The hot springs were probably visited in 1541 by De Soto, who died the following spring on the Mississippi, about 100 miles away. According to traditions the curative properties of the springs were known to the Indians long before the advent of the Spaniards. There is a tale that the various tribes battled from time to time for control of the hot waters, in which they believed the "Great Spirit" to be ever present, but that finally a truce was declared under which their benefits were extended to the sick of all tribes.

It is believed that the earliest white settlement was made about the year 1800. Dunbar and Hunter, who visited the place in December, 1804, found an open log cabin and a few huts built of split boards which had been erected by persons resorting to the springs in the hope of regaining their health. Manuel Prudhomme built a cabin there in 1807 and was joined the same year by John Perciful and Isaac Cates, who camped in the neighborhood and engaged in hunting and trapping. From this time on history is complete.

In 1832 the hot springs and the four sections of land surrounding them were, by act of Congress, set aside for the future disposal of the United States, not to be entered, located, or appropriated for any other purpose whatever, thus making the first national park reservation of the country and preserving in perpetuity, free from monopoly and commercial exploitation, the waters of the springs for the benefit of the sick.

At Hot Springs there are two great mountains, one called the East and the other the West Mountain, located on this reservation. On the East Mountain are the hot springs, and, as I remember, about 47 in number, furnishing 827,000 gallons per day. On the West Mountain, which is only across a small deep valley some two or three hundred feet wide, only cold water is found. No part of the city of Hot Springs is located on the Government reservation, except it be hotels and bathhouses built under lease from the Government. The city of Hot Springs normally contains from eighteen to twenty thousand inhabitants. The uses of the waters on this reservation, and especially the hot waters, are controlled absolutely by the Government of the United States. There are some 20 or 30 bathhouses in Hot Springs, and also a public bathhouse maintained by the Government free to the indigent poor and which is absolutely inadequate. Some of the finest bathhouses in the world, I am told, are located on the reservation, and, in addition to these, an Army and Navy hospital is maintained where our soldiers and sailors are cared for in times of sickness. This reservation and these hot waters belong to the people of the United States, and because Hot

Springs is in the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor I am expected to and am proud to look after the needs and wants of these springs to the end that suffering people may have the greatest benefit from these wonderful healing waters. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is known throughout our broad land that these springs are owned by the Government of the United States, the poor, helpless, and afflicted people from all over the country visit them in the hope of receiving a cure, and when they have reached there thousands and tens of thousands have been restored to health again. I may be also permitted to state that not only do they come there from all over our Nation, but from across the waters and from almost every country in the world.

The amendment to which I have reference was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in 1913, and his report, together with the survey looking to the improvement embraced in the amendment, is found in House Document No. 1928, Sixty-second Congress, third session.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the improvement, in a word?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. For the information of the gentleman I had better read from the report. The recommendation to which I refer as having been made by the Secretary of the Interior is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

"Washington, January 20, 1913.

"SIR: In the sundry civil act approved August 24, 1912, provision was made for preliminary survey of the sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, Ark., in the following terms:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, at the earliest practicable date, to make a survey of the sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, abutting the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., and to prepare plans and estimate of the cost of increasing the present storm drainage system as well as the present sanitary sewer system of the city of Hot Springs, the report of survey, including estimate of cost of the work, to be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable after the 1st day of December, 1912. The expenses incurred hereunder shall not exceed \$10,000; one-half of such expenses shall be paid out of the revenues derived from privileges and otherwise on the Hot Springs Reservation, and the other half shall be paid by the city of Hot Springs, Ark.

"By arrangement between the department and the United States Geological Survey this work was undertaken by Mr. Sledge Tatum, geographer in charge of the Rocky Mountain division of that bureau, and he has submitted his report, which, with accompanying report of J. W. Barnett, consulting engineer, and exhibits, is herewith transmitted for your consideration.

"It will be seen therefrom that an estimate is submitted in the sum of \$26,595 for labor and material in perfecting a sanitary sewer system in Hot Springs and for conducting an experimental sewer purification plant, together with alternative propositions for providing purification plants in the sum of \$70,000 and \$20,000, respectively, dependent upon the system adopted as a result of the experience obtained in experimental plant. Estimate is also submitted in the sum of \$327,540 for drainage system to care for storm waters from the mountains on the Hot Springs Reservation, which amount includes \$89,700 for extending the Hot Springs Creek Arch from its present terminus on Church Street, in the city of Hot Springs, to South Water Street, approximately the city limits. The installation of the sanitary sewer system, however, it is stated, will obviate the necessity for continuing the Hot Springs Creek Arch, with its present terminus at Church Street, because the impurities which are now flowing into the creek under the arch will be cared for by the sanitary sewer system.

"To carry into effect the recommendations embodied in the report will require appropriations by Congress as follows:

"For labor and material for perfecting a sanitary sewer system in the city of Hot Springs, the installation and operation of an experimental purification plant, and providing purification tanks in connection with such system, \$96,595.

"For labor and material required in the installation of a drainage system in the city of Hot Springs, to care for storm waters from the mountains on the Hot Springs Reservation, \$237,840.

"The sewerage system in the city of Hot Springs appears to be such as to require early measures looking to the betterment thereof, and I therefore commend your favorable consideration to the report herewith transmitted, to the end that the appropriations necessary for the completion of the work be provided by Congress."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. How far is Church Street from the Army and Navy Hospital?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I should think about three or four blocks.

Mr. PAYNE. Three or four blocks from the Army and Navy Hospital. Has this drainage canal been extended down to Church Street?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Who did that?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The city of Hot Springs, largely, did it.

Mr. PAYNE. Not the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Not the Government.

In order that you may understand, gentlemen, just why these improvements should be made and this appropriation granted I will explain to you that while the avenue between the two mountains to which I have referred is six or seven hundred feet above the sea level, yet storm waters coming down these mountains into the valley floods the main avenue in the city immediately in front of the hot springs waist deep to a man, flowing into these hotels and bathhouses on the reservation and flooding them, as also many portions of the city; and these floods come from the mountains on the reservation, causing bad waters to belch out of the now inadequate sewer system. I have photographs in my hand showing these flood conditions. People come there to be cured by these waters, and not to be made sick because of sewer conditions. If you ask me why it is that the city of Hot Springs does not take care of this situation, I reply that these people, while willing, benevolent, and patriotic, are the most burden-borne people in any city in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Under the constitution of the State of Arkansas a municipal corporation can not lend its credit and issue bonds, but the only way by which it may be done is by the forming of an improvement district by petition of the people to tax themselves for necessary improvements. This they have done, but the tax is insufficient, and they are unable to meet this great and needed improvement; and in taxing themselves they can not tax any portion of the reservation, because it belongs to the United States Government. I say that Hot Springs every year bears a great burden, and why? The indigent, poor, and afflicted come there from all sections of the Nation, and they land in Hot Springs without food and without money, and the grand, charitable people of that city will not let them starve while they are struggling for health and for life. [Applause.]

As I now recall, without the exact data before me, about 165,000 baths were given to the poor in 1913 in these hot waters. The cures that are wrought are wonderful to think about, if you knew and had seen what I have seen. I remember last Christmas of meeting an old man, a soldier in the Civil War, who had visited Hot Springs, to be treated for rheumatism, and as he was returning home he told me of how horribly he had been afflicted and how much he had been suffering, but that he was then a well man, and, further, he said that he had been almost totally blind for many years, but that when he reached home by the blessing of these waters he would be permitted to look into the faces of grandchildren that he had never seen; that bathing in these waters had restored his eyesight. [Applause.] This is only one instance of wonderful cures derived. There are gentlemen on the floor of this House who can testify as to the great curative properties of these waters.

Should you grant this amendment and allow the improvements to be made, the water which floods the streets and the bathhouses will be conducted out of the city into the Ouachita River and will make Hot Springs what was intended when reserved—a blessing to suffering humanity. I sincerely hope that the Members of this House will cheerfully agree to this appropriation. The money will be well, wisely, and humanely expended. You must remember that charity is the paramount virtue, that all else is but "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

The city of Hot Springs, which is located largely to the south and southwest from the Hot Springs Mountain, has caused to be constructed extensive sewers and has expended thousands of dollars, but which has proven to be insufficient to take care of the storm and flood waters from the mountains on the reservation, and since the Government of the United States owns this reservation I am sure our great people would

not hesitate or complain about the expenditures necessary to make these needed improvements.

Senator KENYON, of Iowa, in speaking in favor of this amendment the other day, said, "I have been there when the town was simply flooded and the sewers could not take care of the flood waters," and further said that "this water pours down from the mountains on the Government reservation, flowing onto the streets." Senator KENYON has often visited Hot Springs and knows whereof he speaks.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will be agreed to. God put these waters in the mountain for sufferers, and their great uses should not be retarded.

When Christ was walking through the valleys and over the hills of Judea, visiting the homes where disease and distress prevailed, in order that He might bring relief and comfort to the sick and the sorrowing, He found in one small space a pool of water called the Pool of Bethesda. Around it gathered day by day a crowd of the afflicted, who were placed beside the pool by their friends, awaiting for the good angel to trouble the waters; and then it was that these poor invalids were dipped in to receive a blessing and a cure. As time moved on our heavenly Father saw that the increasing ages and populations would bring more afflictions to humanity and that greater opportunity for the blessings of health must be provided. The Allseeing Eye evidently scanned the great swelling brows of the mountains in Spain, France, and Italy, and the various beautiful valleys in these countries. He then looked over the immense reach of the Alps, with their snow peaks "pinnacled dim in the intense inane," but He saw no advantageous grounds for a Bethesda in that great scope of country. He then cast his eye over the Appalachian system, that stretches from the turbid waters of the St. Lawrence River to the deep blue waves of the Gulf of Mexico. Nothing along that majestic reach of mountains engaged His attention. He then looked over the mighty and eternal grandeur and sublime solitudes of the gigantic Rockies, from where they take their beginning in the far-off ice fields of Alaska to where they lose their mighty range in the burning sands and storm-raging waters of the Straits of Magellan, but He saw no encouraging spot along that 10,000 miles of broken grandeur. He then looked over the line of the Ozarks, waving their modest green plumes from Missouri to Texas, and He discovered an unpretending little valley in Arkansas where the city of Hot Springs was afterwards located. He touched the spirit of the earthquake and the giant arose and heaved up the mountains on his shoulders and shook them apart and out came these hot waters, sparkling with radium and other medicinal qualities, inspired at every moment and in every drop by the healing presence of untiring angels, and here the lame and halt and afflicted from all over this land and from other parts of the earth come to get the healing blessing. Here the iron sinews of rheumatism are untied; here the steel fingers of paralysis are unloosed; here the agonies of the pain king are soothed and the crutches and chairs of invalids are thrown on the junk pile, while the whole valley and the mountain side are made vocal with the grand acclaims of those who have been restored to health, and from every lip comes that grandest of all doxologies:

Praise God from whom all blessings flow,
Praise Him all creatures here below;
Praise Him above, ye heavenly hosts,
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

[Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I became acquainted with the classic region of Hot Springs 30 years ago, when I went down there with Casey Young, of Tennessee, and John K. Storm, of Pennsylvania, the two majority Members and myself, as an investigating committee. We were there for a whole week, and when the witnesses began to appear and tell what the obligations of the United States were to the benighted inhabitants, I was curious to know about the matter and began to ask questions. The questions were ruled out by the majority members of the committee in charge, but they afterwards relented sufficiently to allow me to cross-examine the witnesses, which I did at the three sessions each day for six days. We finally examined the last witness, and on the day when we came to make our report, although I was the minority member of the committee, I was afterwards permitted to write the report myself, which will be found somewhere in the annals of Congress, I suppose, and that report was used as the text of Mr. Holman, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to ward

off the annual raid made upon the Treasury for the improvement of Hot Springs.

Now, Hot Springs proved to be a Government reservation, not by the act of God, but growing out of a wicked lawsuit between two rival claimants who claimed to own the property; and when the case got to the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court, unfortunately for the United States, found that the United States was the owner of those reservations which my friend from Arkansas thinks were set aside by the providence of man nearly a hundred years ago for the benefit of future generations. It was a blunder if they were set aside at all, and the blunder was only found out at the end of this litigation, some 35 or 40 years ago.

When we went down there we found this condition: On one side was the Government reservation, where the springs were. On the east side of a gorge we found various bathhouses and one large hotel. On the other side were various business houses, on the west mountain, at the foot of the mountain, fronting on the Little Hot Springs River that flowed through the gorge. These were business houses, mostly occupied by gamblers at that time, who proceeded to relieve the people of the money they brought down there. There was a tradition that the Jesse James gang used to operate between Hot Springs and the Iron Mountain road, some 30 miles away, and that the James gang never attacked a party coming out of Hot Springs, because the pickings were too poor. [Laughter.] They always struck a party going into Hot Springs before the nurses and the doctors and the bathhouse people and the hotels had had any chance at them. [Laughter.]

Well, we went there to investigate the building of a new tunnel through this gorge, to take down the flood waters that came from the mountain, both from the reservation and the mountain above, where there were three large streams that joined at the Government reservation and made a heavy flow in time of great storms, when the rain rushed down the mountain. We were there primarily to investigate the complaint that the contractor was not putting the proper material into this tunnel that was there, and they tried to confine the investigation to that; but the people wanted to be heard on something else, and I wanted to hear them, and we went into everything connected with the whole business. When the Government found that it owned the reservations on each side, especially where the springs were, and the reservations where these gambling houses were on the other side of the gorge, they appointed a commission. That commission went down there and assessed the value of the improvements that had been put on by the various people who had built there supposing they were owners, and the commission made awards of the full value of the improvements. Then the Government turned around and rented these places to the former owners, with the improvements, at a nominal rental, and when we were down there the Government was doing a flourishing business in the way of building sewers and building this tunnel, which acted as a sewer for these ground-rent proprietors, including the hotel, which was also leased at a nominal rent, and the company making a mint of money all the time. That was the condition then. They wanted to extend this tunnel down to the Ouachita River. That was the dream of those people who, I suppose, wrote the beautiful poem that my friend recited as a peroration to his speech. By the way, they had a tradition down there that in the early days some immigrant in one of those prairie-schooner wagons stopped with his family at Hot Springs one evening, and after he had put out the teams, and while the family was preparing supper, he went to get a drink of water from a near-by spring. He dipped up a dipperful of it in his tin dipper and put it to his mouth, and the hot water burned his lips. He threw down the dipper and came rushing back and said, "Here, hitch up and get out of here quick. Hell ain't a mile off." [Laughter.] I do not know whether that had anything to do with the improvement that the Government has been building there at the solicitation of the inhabitants ever since or with the rule of the Jesse James gang in after years or not.

Now, they wanted to build this immense culvert on from the lower end of it down to the Ouachita River, about 6 or 7 miles away, as I remember it. They were also building an Army and Navy Hospital at the lower end of this tunnel. In the course of a few years complaint was made that the sewage went into the tunnel. The Government had no sewage. The sewage came from the tenant houses of the Government and from the residents way up the stream. Undoubtedly that polluted this Hot Springs Creek, and they said that the fumes of the sewage were coming from the lower end of the tunnel, and that it was detrimental to the Army and Navy people who were there for the curing of various disorders for which the waters seem to be a

specific. They said they must have that tunnel extended right off, to carry away the fumes. I suggested to the House then, why not let the people at Hot Springs do a little bit of the sewer and culvert construction. Of course, they had the burden of now and then a tramp who came and went into the mudhole, or the rial hole, as it was called, where this free bath has been maintained ever since. They had to take care of some few poor people who came there; but they were able to take care of them, because the rich people came there and spent their money very freely, and every man in Hot Springs, including the attendants at the bathhouses, was getting a large income out of it when I was down there, and I have not heard that any of them went into bankruptcy since then. It looked reasonable to me that they should build sewers if they did not want this sewage to go into this large town. I suggested that they build a sewer on each side of the culvert and pay for it. But they would not do that. The noisomeness of the smell was not so offensive as to induce them to put their hands into their pockets, because it did not hit the pocketbook nerve. They have kept on until they have gotten the Government to build an extension of this culvert down four blocks to Church Street, and now they want it built down to the Ouachita River, 4 or 5 miles away, to carry the sewage into that stream and not offend the fastidious noses of the people who live in Hot Springs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I just want to correct the gentleman. He is mistaken about the residential portion of the city being above the reservation. The residential portion is not there. It is away to the south and the southwest.

Mr. PAYNE. Part of it is there and part of it is below. It was when I was there. I do not know but they have built down more below, because I have not been there in 30 years. When I was there it was above and below.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Everything has changed since then.

Mr. PAYNE. Every once in a while we get an excuse for an appropriation for Hot Springs. When they build a courthouse we have to give them the land to build it on. In order that there may be room enough for the courthouse, we have to give them a big slice of land. Whether they are building on it or not I do not know. Application was made. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] shakes his head. I do not know, but we succeeded in beating the donation of land for the courthouse and allowed the citizens of Hot Springs to pay for it themselves. The greatest financial misfortune for the Government was the discovery at the end of this lawsuit that the Government owned these reservations down there in Hot Springs. It has been a source of expense ever since, and not a source of very large income. I have not examined the matter for a long time, but when I did examine it the Government was a loser because of its ownership of these reservations. Now, it is time Congress stopped and called a halt at Hot Springs, and let the people there do these things, just as they do in every other town in the United States, build the sewerage system and pay for it themselves. We have gone to work and made a survey at the expense of the Geological Survey and made a plan for them. Let them take hold and do it, and do not give them this \$200,000 appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, to be paid for by the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Does the gentleman know that the Government is now receiving a revenue of about \$50,000 a year from this?

Mr. PAYNE. I should be very glad to know that was so. The Government ought to get a good deal more of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. They ought to get a good deal more out of it. If they get \$50,000 a year for the next 30 years, they may get back into the Treasury what has gone out of it in the years past, when it was a burden upon the people of the United States. Let Hot Springs citizens do something for themselves. Give them a chance. It helps people so much to be required to help themselves. Nothing is so bad for a community as to be supported partly at the Government expense. It hurts citizens who are well to do the same as it hurts poor people to be helped without using their own initiative and their own energy. I hope the conferees will stick to the disagreement until the last gun is fired, and if they want a sewer system for Hot Springs let them come in with a bill by itself so that Repre-

sentatives can vote their honest convictions and not seem to be holding up an appropriation bill that ought to have been passed two months ago in order to help citizens at Hot Springs, Ark.

They have made a lot of money there out of the Government, and the town has grown up out of the Government reservation. We have sealed up the springs, built a sort of a cone over them of cement in order that no drop of hot water shall be wasted, and we have piped and conducted it to one reservoir in order to keep every drop of hot water and protect it so that it may be used by these bathhouses that are run by the people who rent them. They are not run by the Government of the United States. Fifty thousand dollars a year! If a private individual owned it, he would get a million dollars out of it, and with the same price to the ultimate consumer and without any effort. It is only another illustration of the Government trying to do business. It can not do it at a profit; it can not do it and get its expenses out of it. There is no excuse for the Government doing it in this instance, because they could surround the legislation by such safeguards that private individuals could not gouge the public as they do now. I hope that this provision will not get into the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the peculiar attitude of the people directly interested in Hot Springs, Ark., is illustrated by amendment No. 96 of the Senate. An estimate was made by the Secretary of the Treasury of \$20,000 to repair the free bathhouse at Hot Springs. At the hearing it developed that the free bathhouse was in bad condition; that the tubs needed repairing; that the plumbing was out of order, and that these repairs were essential and necessary if the free bathhouse was to be put in decent condition for use.

The House committee brought in the item of \$20,000 for that purpose. The Senate struck it out, I suppose, at the instance or suggestion of those particularly interested in these appropriations. And having stricken out that necessary item of \$20,000, they then ask us to spend \$235,000 for the building of a sewer for the people of Hot Springs.

Now, it occurs to me that these gentlemen interested in Hot Springs and the Hot Springs Reservation would be in a better position before Congress if they showed less interest in the construction of these structures which should be constructed wholly or partly by the people of Hot Springs and more interest in those things that are necessary from a congressional standpoint for the utilization of the springs by people of limited means. If there is any excuse at all for the Government maintaining the hot springs and spending a large amount of money there, it is by reason of the fact that we furnish free baths to those unable to pay for them.

This free bathhouse is utilized by many thousands of poor and afflicted people every year. It is in a shameful condition of disrepair, as all those familiar with the situation understand. And yet the friends of Hot Springs struck out this item, necessary from a governmental standpoint, and insist on our providing a sewer system for the city.

I regret that the conferees on the part of the House agreed to strike out the item of \$20,000. I understand their position, that when the people locally interested say that they do not want it they could not well insist on keeping it in. What they do want is to wait a year or so and have us appropriate a large sum of money for a new bathhouse, which is not necessary. The old bathhouse, with a reasonable appropriation, can be put in good condition.

It occurs to me that people locally interested in Hot Springs are not evidencing very good faith in the matter when they use their influence to strike out a necessary appropriation for a public purpose in order to strengthen their demand or request for a large appropriation for the purpose of an expenditure that should be borne wholly or largely by the people locally.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this proposition is a matter that concerns the local community, but I look upon the proposition like I look upon all questions coming before the House where the Government is involved, whether in Washington or somewhere else. I think that where the Government of the United States owns a piece of property it ought to stand in the same attitude toward that property that an individual does. I do not think that because the Government of the United States owns a piece of property in a State or a community it ought to be made a burden on that community. On the other hand, I do not believe that because it owns a piece of property it ought to be expected to do for that property any more than anybody else in the community ought to do.

As I understand the situation, it is that here are two mountains which the Government owns as a reservation. The drainage of these mountains comes down a narrow gorge that happens to be a street. The Government owns one side of the street and private individuals own the other side of the street. The sewerage is on the Government side of the street and on Government property. The sewer system is not large enough to carry off the water. When there is a heavy rainfall it comes down the side of the mountain and follows the gorge, and the sewer system is not big enough to carry the water off. That is the whole proposition—whether the Government is going to make the same contribution to carry off this water from its own land that would be made if the Government sold the land to a private individual.

If the Government does not want to own the land, it can give it away, sell it, or dispose of it in some way. If these two mountain sides were owned by a private individual, running that spring, as the Government does, to raise revenue from it, undoubtedly the State of Arkansas or the city of Hot Springs would assess that drainage area in building this sewer. To-day the sewer is on the Government side of the street and I think on Government property. The Government rents out that property and receives rentals, and the only question involved in this case, I think, is whether or not the Government should contribute as a private individual would to take care of this storm water. As to the amount of the contribution the Government should make, I know nothing about it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. The Government already has built most of it some 30 years ago—this improvement in front of its own reservations where the hot springs are and where the property is on the other side of the street—and paid for it, and this is to be a continuation of that improvement, and not because that improvement is not adequate to carry off the water from the Government property.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not so understand it, because the pictures the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] showed me shows where the water dams up, and it is in the gorge between the Government property.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. And these pictures were taken by the Government of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. But the gentleman says that this improvement is to be continued from the lower end of it at Church Street, southward.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know anything about where it is. I say this is a practical business proposition put to this House. It is the same thing as is involved in the District of Columbia. I say where the Government owns a large amount of property in this District it ought to contribute to the District government, and I have always stood for that proposition; and if the Government continues to hold this reservation, it is nothing but equitable and just that the Government should make a contribution toward taking care of the drainage waters. If the Government does not want the property, sell it and dispose of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anyone know what the total cost of the improvement would be?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman speaks of the equity of the Government making a contribution to the building of this sewage system. This is a proposition to have the Government build it, not to make any contribution. The city of Hot Springs is not participating in it at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that is a question for the conferees to consider. I am not arguing the question of what they ought to do.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the motion is to recede and concur, which would put the Government to the expense of building the whole thing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I want to say that the city of Hot Springs, lying far to the southwest, has its own sewage system, and it takes all of its taxes to maintain that, and the Government is throwing this water down on the city.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish it understood that I am saying what part the Government should contribute in dollars and cents, because I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman in favor of this motion to recede and concur?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Government ought to contribute toward it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to know if the gentleman is in favor of the motion?

Mr. BUTLER. That is what I want to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would really prefer the gentlemen to take the matter to the conferees and decide what is a fair proportion for the Government to pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the question before the House is to recede and concur in this amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose the gentleman from New York is not in favor of doing anything.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not in favor of doing anything unless you desire to build sewers for every municipality that can work the Government upon some specious plea for doing it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very remarkable situation in which the House finds itself. The Senate has incorporated in this bill an amendment to appropriate \$237,000 to build a sewage system for the city of Hot Springs, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], interested as we all are in keeping the appropriations within reason upon this side of the House, is supporting this motion, although he states he is not familiar with the facts. The plea upon which the request is made is that the Government owns the mountain, and that the surface waters from storms flowing down the mountain flow through the city of Hot Springs. Will anybody suggest that a private owner of any property should be compelled to build a sewer for a city because the surface water flows down the natural grade to where a sewer should be built? Twenty-eight thousand dollars will build the necessary sanitary sewer for the city of Hot Springs. Forty-six thousand dollars will build a more improved type, rather than an experimental type. But the city of Hot Springs, built upon a Government reservation, upon lots sold at a great bargain by the Government to those who located there, upon lots leased to residents of Hot Springs, and every dollar the Government gets outside of the Arlington Hotel lease is only \$7,500 a year, and until two years ago it had received for the ground rental for property upon which is a \$500,000 hotel only \$5,000, and for a few years and during the greater period of the 20-year lease only \$2,500 a year, because Congress has been so easy, because it has been so simple a matter to get money out of the Federal Treasury. To keep this rich gold mine for the benefit of the people of Hot Springs, Ark., it is now proposed, when this bill is being pressed for final enactment into law, to try and crowd into it an item of \$237,000, not for the benefit of the Government, not to perform an obligation of the Government, but to relieve the people of Hot Springs, Ark., from the obligation to provide the sewer facilities necessary for that city. Has anybody ever proposed during the three or four years that this matter has been under consideration any system, any plan, any scheme for the construction of a sewer and the apportionment of a proper charge to the Government for which it might be under obligation to pay?

A few years ago, when an item was inserted in this bill to appropriate \$10,000 for a survey to find out what was necessary, the House conferees insisted that one half of the necessary amount be paid out of the revenues of Hot Springs Reservation and the other half by the city of Hot Springs, Ark. The survey cost a little under \$7,000, and there was nearly a riot in the city of Hot Springs because it was proposed that a single dollar should be imposed upon the people of that community in order to ascertain what was required in the way of sewer facilities. This item has no business in this bill. The conferees on the part of the House—the House itself—has no information that would justify them in acting favorably upon this item. The committees of the House that have jurisdiction should take it, and if a sewer system is necessary it should be provided by the city of Hot Springs, with a Government contribution that could be worked out and reported to the House with the information necessary to justify the House in acting. We have been contending, Mr. Speaker, during this session and other sessions of the House against the imposition of such items as this. It is difficult enough to prevent these appropriation bills from being loaded down with other indefensible propositions, possibly forced through here under stress of circumstances. This item can not be justified. It is simply a naked attempt to let the Federal Government spend \$237,000 to build a sewer system for the city of Hot Springs, Ark., and relieve the people of that community of all obligations—

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). To provide sewer facilities and make the Federal Government bear a burden that does not belong to it and far beyond what any reasonable man would suggest it should bear. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Does the gentleman realize that this is not a recommendation by the citizens of Hot Springs but by the Secretary of the Interior, and that he requests an

expenditure identically the same as that carried in the amendment to this appropriation bill?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know something about the history of this item. I know that there was an active and efficient young man, who was a clerk in the District Department, who visited Hot Springs Reservation a few years ago and had conversations with some of the leading citizens of Hot Springs. They presented to him a number of suggestions as to what should be done by the Federal Government. He undertook, as representing the United States Government, to pass upon what the Federal Government should do, and he recommended that \$237,000 should be appropriated, as here suggested. I have never known of a Secretary of the Interior who had any personal information about it or to make any recommendation about it. It has never been submitted in an estimate to Congress, but has been put in this bill twice by the Senate. The House rejected it on a former occasion, and I hope it will be rejected on this occasion. I desire to say to my friends on this side of the House that in the adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on this bill those representing the House endeavored to agree upon those things that could be justified before the House and the country. The bill as passed by the House carried \$110,000,000. The Senate added \$4,300,000 to it. The House receded from \$1,600,000 of items; the Senate receded from \$1,800,000 of items. There are in dispute about \$737,000. Of the items on which the House receded to the extent of \$1,600,000 I believe that at least half were for the acquisition of sites for public buildings. It is unfair of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the little information he has on this subject, to urge the House to agree—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's statement is unfair—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The position I take on the matter, and I think it is eminently fair, is that when the committees of this House have a problem before them where Government property is involved they should look at it exactly as if it were individual property, because that is fair to the Government and it is fair to the citizens. If there is a drainage area that extends over a very wide area of country in my community, and if water shall be on that area, it is assessed, and if the Government owns a large portion of that area it should not put all the burden on that people.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has said that already. I have not taken the position that we should deal differently with this matter than if it were a private individual. I take the position that the people of Hot Springs, Ark., should not be permitted to use the Federal Treasury to do their work. This is not before a committee of the House; it was not before a committee of the House; no committee of the House has examined into it. The gentleman from Alabama insists that the conferees shall not agree to items in this bill over which his committee has jurisdiction. Why should he urge the conferees to agree to an item over which some other committee than the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction? I am opposed to agreeing to this item. I can not tell—I do not know where anybody can obtain the information as to how much, if anything, the Federal Government should contribute to this sewer. I do know it should not contribute \$237,000; I do know that the people of Hot Springs, Ark., should not have this sewer system built at the expense of the Federal Government and without cost to them, and therefore I am opposing the item.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman answer this question for me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would not interfere with the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but this is an appropriation bill—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the item is not authorized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not necessary to have an authorization for the committee to act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; it is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman's committee has not jurisdiction over this question, what committee of the House has?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Committee on Public Lands, I suppose, as this is a Government reservation, but certainly the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an appropriation. The gentleman from New York himself would very quickly antagonize a proposition for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to

make a direct appropriation and not an authorization. And this is an appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In apportioning the cost between the Federal Government and the people of Hot Springs it ought to be fixed by legislation. We have no information upon which to act intelligently. We did have an estimate from the Secretary of the Treasury of \$20,000 to put in suitable condition the baths and plumbing in the public bathhouses used by the poor unfortunates who go there as charity patients to take the baths. But they do not vote in Hot Springs, Ark. The people who want this sewer do. So it was insisted that the money that should be used in putting the bathtubs and bathing places in shape, so that these poor, unfortunate derelicts who might have the benefit of the baths might take them without danger of contamination should be eliminated from the bill, and that this item, not recommended by the department, for the benefit of the people who ought to pay the cost of it, should be incorporated.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I would like to have a clear understanding of this. Does the Government take care of the water on the Government property? Is the sewer already on the Government property, and is this to construct a sewer on the Government property? Who owns the property on each side of the street?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Government.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. The Government owns on both sides of the street?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But some of it has been sold, or some of it has been leased under ground leases.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then private individuals live on one side of this sewer?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of the baths are operated by the Government and some, I understand, by the lessees from the Government. On the other side is property owned by other persons. Now, a septic sewer, that would relieve the situation of all the offensiveness, can be built, one kind for \$28,000 and the other for \$46,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not this legislation; and if the Committee on Appropriations had reported it to the House, would it not have been subject to a point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is legislation, of course, and has no business here.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the total cost of the proposed improvement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. And what is the proportion of the property owned by the Government as it relates to the whole property to be benefited by the improvement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody know?

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I can tell you.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Then nobody knows what the proper proportion of the Government contribution toward this improvement would be?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the total proceeds of the sale of lots amounted to \$82,000, and that was permanently appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the bathhouses.

Mr. MADDEN. So, as a matter of fact, there is not anybody connected with this case who can tell what the proportion of the city of Hot Springs should be and whether there should be any proportion levied against the Federal Government at all?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not been able to obtain that information in the examination I have made of the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, until we do obtain that information, the House surely ought not to approve this project.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has four minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me a few minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I want to state that the reservation of the Government now comprises 1,100 acres. The greater part of the city of Hot Springs is not now, nor was it ever, on what is known now as the Government reservation. The gentleman from New York speaks about the conditions that existed 30 years ago. Those conditions may

have existed then, but do not exist now. At that time it was a straggling village of a few thousand people, while to-day it is a city of 20,000 or 30,000 people, and each year 165,000 poor people visit there to take advantage of these wonderful curative waters. This is not a proposition to build a sewer system for the city of Hot Springs, and any man who knows the facts or who will take the public document that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] had in his hand a moment ago and study it, and study the map there, will see that this is a proposition to provide a storm sewer for the Government reservation and not for the city of Hot Springs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

Mr. WINGO. For just a second.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. I desire to state to the House that there used to be a creek down this valley. Will the gentleman refer to that?

Mr. WINGO. The culvert that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] referred to was the one the Government built along the stream, the narrow gorge that lies between the two Government properties, to take care of a creek that ran through there, and not to take care of the sewage. The greater part of Hot Springs has been built up since the gentleman from New York was there. The greater part of the residences of the city lie down to the south and west of the reservation, and that part has its own sewerage system. This proposition is that the Government shall build this sewer to take care of the waters that come from the Hot Springs Reservation, on Government property. The gentleman says there is no sewage that comes from the Government property. The Government has an Army and Navy Hospital, and the boys from the Army and Navy are treated there. Every year thousands go to the Army and Navy Hospital and are taken care of at the Government buildings on the side of the East Mountain. Drives have been laid out, and the curb and surface drains have caused the water to shoot down with great force into the street in the narrow gorge, on one side of which is entirely Government property and on the other side mostly Government property; and the water rushes out there in time of rain from the Government reservation of 1,100 acres, so that the water floods what? The residences? No. The business houses? Yes, to some extent; but the greater part of the property that is damaged is the property of the United States Government bathhouses on which we have spent thousands of dollars in years past.

Ah, but the gentleman says there has been no proper estimate. There has been a proper estimate by the Interior Department. This is a business proposition for the Government to take care of its own property.

Oh, they say, it is not proper for the Government to make this appropriation. The Government is almost the only party to be protected. Instead of the Government bearing this expense, if the private property only were assessed, it would amount to confiscation. True, these waters that run down there do flow out into some part of the city. That is true. The water does flow until it reaches a higher grade, reaching into some parts of the business district. It is simply a proposition as to whether or not the Government will take care of its own property and protect that property, and incidentally the business section of the city, from the storm waters that flow from the reservation. Hot Springs does not ask for this as a matter of favor or charity, but as a matter of justice. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is confronted with the proposition to recede on an item for nearly a quarter of a million dollars for a sewer system which the gentleman from Arkansas says is not for the benefit of the city of Hot Springs, but which we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, who have investigated the matter from year to year, say is for the benefit of the city of Hot Springs.

Now, the very fact of that dispute shows the lack of wisdom in passing such an appropriation upon a supply bill with no more investigation than can be had here. Here is a Government reservation. Men build a town alongside of it, and then they say that because they are alongside of it and there is surface drainage from the Government land, that imposes an obligation on the Government to build a sewer to take care of such drainage waters.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I have but a few minutes. That is a proposition I will not agree to. The gentleman from Alabama

[Mr. UNDERWOOD] undertakes to make a comparison between the District of Columbia and the Hot Springs Reservation. There is no real, just basis for such a comparison. But if there was, it would hardly be a good one, because the Government of the United States has rarely got its equal rights when it came to dealing with the citizens of the District of Columbia. I fear that the gentleman from Alabama is qualifying himself for service in that other body, whose chief work is not in the interest of economy; and I ask this body, which is charged with the duty of holding down expenditures—I ask those on this side, who have made some claim to economical tendencies—to hesitate before we agree to lay on the Government the entire cost of an elaborate sewerage system, a system more elaborate than is necessary, even if one is built. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The vote is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] demands a division. Those in favor of receding and concurring will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-three gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Eighty-nine gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this vote the yeas are 43 and the noes are 89.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of no quorum and demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker has declared that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is too slow.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TAYLOR] to recede from the House disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 91 and concur therein will, when their names are called, vote yea; those opposed will vote nay.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 67, nays 170, answered "present" 4, not voting, 192, as follows:

YEAS—67.

Abercrombie	Collier	Hawley	Oldfield
Allen	Curry	Hayden	Park
Ansberry	Deitrick	Heflin	Rainey
Ashbrook	Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Raker
Baker	Diffenderfer	Johnson, Wash.	Reed
Bathrick	Driscoll	Kahn	Roberts, Nev.
Bell, Cal.	Evans	Keating	Stephens, Cal.
Blackmon	Fergusson	Kettner	Stout
Broussard	Ferris	Kindel	Taggart
Burgess	Floyd, Ark.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Taylor, Ark.
Burke, Wis.	Garrett, Tenn.	McKellar	Taylor, Colo.
Burnett	Glittins	MacDonald	Ten Eyck
Campbell	Goeke	Morgan, Okla.	Underwood
Caraway	Goodwin, Ark.	Mulkey	Watkins
Carter	Hardy	Murdock	Williams
Church	Harris	Nolan, J. I.	Wingo
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	O'Hair	

NAYS—170.

Adamson	Claypool	Flood, Va.	Hill
Aiken	Cline	Fordney	Holland
Alexander	Connelly, Kans.	Foster	Howell
Anderson	Conry	Fowler	Hull
Avis	Covington	Francis	Johnson, Utah
Bailey	Cox	French	Kelley, Mich.
Baltz	Cramton	Gard	Kelly, Pa.
Barkley	Cullop	Garner	Kennedy, Iowa
Barnhart	Danforth	Garrett, Tex.	Kent
Bartholdt	Decker	Gillett	Key, Ohio
Barton	Dickinson	Gilmore	Kirkpatrick
Beakes	Dillon	Godwin, N. C.	Konop
Booher	Dixon	Good	Korbly
Borchers	Donovan	Graham, Ill.	La Follette
Britten	Doolittle	Gray	Langley
Brodbeck	Doremus	Green, Iowa	Lee, Ga.
Brumbaugh	Doughton	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Pa.
Bryan	Dupré	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot
Buchanan, Tex.	Edmonds	Hamlin	Lewis, Md.
Burke, S. Dak.	Esch	Haugen	Lieb
Butler	Falson	Hay	Lindbergh
Byrnes, S. C.	Falconer	Helgesen	Lloyd
Byrns, Tenn.	Fitzgerald	Helm	Logue
Carr	FitzHenry	Hensley	Loneragan

McAndrews	Patton, Pa.	Sharp	Talcott, N. Y.
McCoy	Payne	Sherley	Tavener
McKenzie	Peters, Mass.	Sherwood	Thacher
Madden	Peters, Me.	Sinnott	Towner
Maguire, Nebr.	Peterson	Sisson	Townsend
Mann	Phelan	Sloan	Treadway
Mapes	Platt	Small	Tribble
Mondell	Quin	Smith, Idaho	Tuttle
Montague	Ragsdale	Smith, Minn.	Underhill
Moore	Reilly, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead
Morrison	Rogers	Smith, Saml. W.	Walsh
Moss, Ind.	Rouse	Stedman	Watson
Moss, W. Va.	Rubey	Steenerson	Webb
Neely, W. Va.	Rucker	Stephens, Miss.	Whaley
Norton	Russell	Stephens, Tex.	Witherspoon
Oglesby	Scott	Stevens, Minn.	Woodruff
Padgett	Seldomridge	Stevens, N. H.	Young, N. Dak.
Page, N. C.	Sells	Stone	
Palmer	Shackleford	Talbott, Md.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Clancy	Moon	Sims	Slemp
--------	------	------	-------

NOT VOTING—192.

Adair	Elder	Jones	Post
Ainey	Estopinal	Keister	Pou
Anthony	Fairchild	Kennedy, Conn.	Powers
Aswell	Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Prouty
Austin	Fess	Kless, Pa.	Rauch
Barchfeld	Fields	Kinhead, N. J.	Rayburn
Bartlett	Finley	Kitchin	Reilly, Conn.
Beall, Tex.	Frear	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan
Bell, Ga.	Gallagher	Kreider	Roberts, Mass.
Borland	Gallivan	Lafferty	Rothermel
Bowdle	Gardner	Langham	Rupley
Brockson	George	Lazaro	Sabath
Brown, N. Y.	Gerry	L'Engle	Saunders
Brown, W. Va.	Gill	Leshner	Scully
Browne, Wis.	Glass	Lever	Shreve
Browning	Goldfogle	Levy	Slayden
Bruckner	Gordon	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, J. M. C.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gorman	Lindquist	Smith, Md.
Bulkley	Goulden	Linthicum	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Lobeck	Sparkman
Calder	Gregg	Loft	Stafford
Callaway	Griest	McClellan	Stanley
Candler, Miss.	Griffin	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantor	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Stringer
Cantrill	Guernsey	McLaughlin	Summers
Carew	Hamill	Mahan	Sutherland
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	Maher	Switzer
Cary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Manahan	Taylor, Ala.
Casey	Hammond	Martin	Taylor, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hardwick	Merritt	Temple
Coady	Hart	Metz	Thomas
Connolly, Iowa	Hayes	Miller	Thompson, Okla.
Cooper	Helvering	Mitchell	Thomson, Ill.
Copley	Henry	Morgan, La.	Vare
Crisp	Hinds	Morin	Vaughan
Crosser	Hinebaugh	Mott	Vollmer
Dale	Hobson	Murray, Mass.	Walker
Davenport	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Wallin
Davis	Howard	Neeley, Kans.	Walters
Dershem	Hoxworth	Nelson	Weaver
Dies	Hughes, Ga.	O'Brien	Whitacre
Donohoe	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Leary	White
Dooling	Hulings	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Drukker	Humphrey, Wash.	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Dunn	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker	Wilson, N. Y.
Eagan	Igoe	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Eagle	Jacoway	Plumley	Woods
Edwards	Johnson, S. C.	Porter	Young, Tex.

So the motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 91 and concur in the same was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the remainder of this session:

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. METZ with Mr. WALLIN.

Until further notice:

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. BOWDLE with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. BULKLEY with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CANTRELL with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DERSHEM with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ELDER with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. IGOE with Mr. HINEBAUGH.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. LESHER with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. MANAHAN.
 Mr. LEVY with Mr. LAFFERTY.
 Mr. MITCHELL with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. WOODS.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. RUPLEY.
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. THOMSON of Illinois.
 Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. WALTERS.
 Mr. RAUCH with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. WILLIS.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
 Mr. STRINGER with Mr. PROUTY.
 Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. KEISTER.
 Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. ASWELL with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. RUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. COOPER.
 Mr. GORMAN with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. SAEATH with Mr. SWITZER.
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. PARKER.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. AINEY.
 Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MERRITT.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CLANCY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. VAUGHAN with Mr. SHREVE.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. HINDS.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.
 Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 145.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 145.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] makes a preferential motion, that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 145 and concur in the same.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that that amendment be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 145: On page 167 of the printed bill insert the following:

"PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

"Building to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition: For the construction of a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio of San Francisco, State of California, in which the Government Exhibit Board, created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, shall install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the said building shall be erected under the authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended from the appropriation made herein, on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, for entertaining the officers and representatives of foreign governments who may attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International

Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority of Congress.

"The provisions contained in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914,' which provides for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, be amended as follows: Under the head of 'To provide for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition,' the paragraph on page 81, which reads as follows: 'The President of the United States is authorized to detail three civilian officers or employees from the executive departments as members of a commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission, one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner shall receive in addition to his original compensation his actual necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerical, office, and other necessary and actual expenses of said commission,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'The President of the United States is authorized to detail two civilian officers or employees from the executive departments, also one to be appointed from civil life, as members of the commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission; one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State, the commissioner appointed from civil life to receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum until the exposition closes. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner detailed as aforesaid shall receive, in addition to his original compensation, necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence while on duty in San Francisco. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerk hire and actual expenses of said commission.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time does the gentleman want, five minutes?

Mr. KAHN. There are quite a number of gentlemen who would like to be heard upon the motion. I would like about 40 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Make it 30 minutes on a side. There are some very important matters yet to come up.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest 40 minutes. I have had numerous requests for time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Make it 35 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Thirty-five minutes on a side, then.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that there be 35 minutes on a side on the pending motion, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and one-half by myself, and that at the end of that time the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that debate on these two motions be confined to 35 minutes on a side, one-half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and that at the end of the 70 minutes the question be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized for 35 minutes. If no one wishes to speak, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is about three years and a half since Congress, by giving the stamp of its approval, located the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco, and in accordance with this action the President of the United States extended an invitation to the nations of the world to participate in this exposition.

In the sundry civil bill a year ago an appropriation of \$500,000 was made for the preparation of a Government exhibit at this exposition, and ever since that time the work of preparing the exhibit has been going on under the auspices of officials designated by the President. The importance of making a suitable exhibit by the United States is self-evident. It is this country that has extended the invitation to foreign powers. The United States is, in a sense, the host of all foreign countries and of all foreigners who bring to this land their wares, their curios, and their objects of art for the education and enlightenment of all who may attend the exposition.

March 31 last the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, transmitted to Congress a letter from the Secretary of State calling attention to the inadequate arrangements for housing the Government exhibit. Secretary Bryan stated that in order to be imposing the exhibit should be collected under one roof, and the statements of Secretary Bryan were indorsed by the President, and the entire matter referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

In accordance with these suggestions I was directed by the committee to confer with Secretary Bryan and Secretary Garrison, and two hearings were held upon the proposed bill, which was duly introduced into the House and is now upon the calendar.

A large part of the Panama-Pacific Exposition is to be located upon the Presidio, a Government reservation where the military department of the Pacific is at present located. Ever since the war in the Philippines it has been found necessary by the War Department to make this military department at San Francisco the largest and possibly the most important in the United States. The buildings for that purpose are inadequate, and it was through the cooperation of the Secretaries of State and War that the idea was suggested that a suitable building could be provided by the United States in which to house its exhibit at the Panama-Pacific Exposition, and yet the building be so constructed as to make it available for the purposes of the Department of War after the close of the exposition.

Secretary Garrison, when he appeared before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, emphasized the necessity of more accommodations for the military arm of the Government at the Presidio. He stated that at present the buildings occupied by part of the soldiers were little better than shacks, and except for the favorable climate Congress would have been called upon to provide appropriations for permanent buildings on the Presidio long ago.

The attention of the committee was called to the number of foreign Governments that had accepted invitations to make an exhibit on this occasion. A majority of the States will have buildings commensurate with their importance, and altogether an estimate of \$50,000,000 is made as the amount that will be invested in the great exposition of 1915. This country should not be guilty of parsimony in a great enterprise of this kind. The richest country in the world should be properly represented at what is expected to be the greatest exposition of modern times. [Applause.]

In view of the fact that the bill reported by the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has not been reached upon the calendar, I append the bill reported from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions and the report on same:

A bill (H. R. 16327) to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the said Government Exhibit Board created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, properly to install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific Exposition the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the erection in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, which may be used in connection with the said Panama-Pacific International Exposition, of a suitable building in which to install, display, and safeguard the said exhibits of the Government of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the said building shall be so planned and of such permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design as shall be approved by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That the said building shall be erected under authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct.

[House Report No. 686, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

GOVERNMENT BUILDING, PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. UNDERHILL, from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 16327:

The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, having had under consideration a bill to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, report the same with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Pacific," insert the word "International."

On page 1, line 8, after the letters "tion," strike out all the rest of the line and lines 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 to and including the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to erect by contract or otherwise."

On page 2, line 1, after the letters "ing," insert the following: "in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, at a cost not to exceed \$500,000."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "War," strike out the rest of the line and all of lines 9 and 10.

Amend the title so that it will read, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to erect a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for other purposes."

On April 2, 1914, the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress, transmitting the statement of the Secretary of State, recommending an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. The message of the President and the statement of the Secretary of State are as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation of \$500,000 for the erection of a building within which to install, display, and safeguard at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco the Government exhibit authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913.

As pointed out by the Secretary of State, many of the Governments officially invited guests by the United States to participate in the exposition are erecting buildings within which to house their exhibits at the exposition. The Government of the United States should not be behind these in appropriately providing for its national exhibit.

I commend the recommendation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, March 31, 1914.

The President:

The sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, appropriates \$500,000 for the purpose of inaugurating, installing, maintaining, and returning a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to open at San Francisco next year, of such articles and materials as illustrate the functions and administrative faculty of the Government of the United States tending to demonstrate the nature and growth of our institutions, their adaptation to the wants of the people, and the progress of the Nation in the arts of peace and war; and authorized the President to provide for the collection and exhibition of such articles and materials under the direction of a board which is created by the act, to which is imposed the duty of determining the nature and character and extent of the exhibits to be made and which is charged with the collection, purchase, preparation, safe-keeping, and exhibition and return of such articles and materials as the board may decide shall be exhibited. But no provision is made by that act or by any previous or subsequent act for the erection of a suitable building within which these exhibits may be installed, displayed, and safeguarded.

The policy of the Federal Government to support the exposition was fixed by the joint resolution of February 15, 1911, which requested the President of the United States to invite all the nations of the earth to participate therein, and the invitation extended in pursuance thereof by the President to all the nations of the earth to take part in the exposition gives to the exposition in the minds of the foreign Governments an official character.

Twenty-seven of these Governments have responded favorably to the invitation, most of which have buildings in course of construction in which to house their exhibits, while many of our States have signified their intention to take a worthy part in the exposition and have made provision for the erection of State buildings. Of the Governments which have not yet accepted the invitation, few have actually declined, while others are awaiting the assembling of their legislative bodies for appropriate action.

I deem it important that the Government of the United States should make at the exposition such a display as will be commensurate with the international scope and importance of the exposition and as will comport with the dignity and standing of the United States. This can not be done, and the exhibit would be of little value if scattered through the exposition buildings, space in which I understand is already insufficient for individual exhibitors. To be imposing it should be collected together under one roof. The site set apart for the building is on the Government reservation in the Presidio. A building there erected by the Government could no doubt be utilized after the exposition for Army uses and it should be constructed with that end in view.

The sum of \$500,000 is not too large for this purpose, and I recommend that Congress be requested to appropriate that amount for the erection of the building.

Respectfully submitted.

W. J. BRYAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 30, 1914.

Your committee is satisfied that a building of the character contemplated by this legislation ought to be erected at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Twenty-six or twenty-seven foreign Governments have accepted the invitation of the President of the United States to participate at said exposition. Each of these Governments will construct a building for the housing of its exhibits. As the Government of the United States is the host at this exposition, it is but fitting and proper that our Government should also have a building wherein its exhibits can be displayed to the best possible advantage. Unless a building such as is contemplated by this bill is constructed, the exhibits of the United States Government will be scattered through a number of buildings and the very purpose of assembling the Government exhibit so that it may be an object lesson to the citizens of the United States as well as visitors from abroad will be destroyed. In expositions that have been held heretofore, the Government display has invariably been one of the main attractions. Your committee has been informed that the exhibit contemplated by the commission authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913, will be the most comprehensive and instructive that has ever been assembled. It would be a pity to scatter it through half a dozen or more buildings. The citizens of the Republic ought to know the many activities in which the Government is engaged and those activities ought to be exhibited in the most comprehensive and instructive manner. We feel that they can be shown to much better advantage under one roof in a building such as is contemplated by this bill, as otherwise many of them will be lost sight of by a large part of the visitors and the very purposes of a Government exhibit will be destroyed.

In addition to these foreign Governments nearly all of the States of the Union have accepted the invitation to be represented and will put up their own buildings to house their exhibits and provide places of assembly for the citizens of the various Commonwealths.

The building contemplated by this legislation will be of a permanent character and will be so constructed that it can be used by the War Department when the exposition is over. The Secretary of War appeared before your committee and pointed out that he believed a proper building for exhibition purposes could be so constructed that after the close of the exposition it could be converted into a barracks. He pointed out that it is absolutely necessary to erect barracks at San Francisco for one regiment, because the troops there are now living in most curious buildings that look like soup kitchens temporarily turned into living apartments. He called attention to the fact that they are long, low-framed buildings, built of cheap lumber, and that if it were not for the splendid climate of California they would probably not have been able to stand as long as they have. He said frankly that in the climate of the eastern section of this country they would not have stood so long. The Secretary of War further stated that it will be impossible to go on for many more years without erecting a barracks for infantry at the Presidio; that it has been the policy of the department in recent years to put up one substantial building, mostly of some kind of concrete, and housing just as many men as can be housed under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

In view of the fact that the buildings that are used at present for barracks by the enlisted men of the Army in the Presidio are entirely inadequate for the purposes for which they are being used, and believing that the construction of the building authorized by this bill will serve a useful and permanent purpose, and in further view of the fact that the legislation is recommended by the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the War Department, your committee feels that the building should be authorized by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have used five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). The Chair will notify the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, when it was proposed to hold an exposition to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal, two cities in the United States competed for the opportunity to hold the exposition, San Francisco and New Orleans. New Orleans asked that \$1,000,000 be appropriated for an exhibit and for buildings for a Government exhibit. San Francisco pledged itself that it would not ask a dollar from the Federal Government for a building or for an exhibit. On January 31, 1911, when the question was before the House as to whether San Francisco or New Orleans should be selected, Mr. KAHN said:

California did not propose at any time to come to the Congress for a single dollar of appropriation for this exposition. The legislature of our State on the 23d of January last unanimously passed a joint resolution pledging the honor of the people of California never to ask for a single dollar in aid of this international exposition, and the people of California keep their faith.

I was one of the Members of this House who voted for San Francisco upon the strength of those pledges. Subsequently the House had a bill before it to appropriate \$2,000,000 urged by the people of California for a governmental exhibit for buildings and for an elaborate commission. That bill was defeated in this House. Later the Senate incorporated in the sundry civil bill an item appropriating \$1,500,000 for a Government exhibit for buildings and a commission. The House voted on three separate propositions—to give \$1,000,000, to give \$750,000, and to give \$500,000. It voted down the first two propositions, but voted to appropriate \$500,000 for a Government exhibit, providing a board to consist of officials of the Government to be detailed for that purpose, eliminating all paid commissioners, and providing in the law that the exposition company should furnish the necessary building or buildings to house the Government exhibit. The board created under that act has been appointed. It has been at work, has planned and designed the Government exhibits, the space has been allotted for them in various buildings, and these exhibits are being prepared to be sent when the time comes for the exhibition in San Francisco.

The Senate has incorporated in this bill an amendment providing \$500,000 for a building, which can not be constructed in time to house the exhibits for the opening of the fair, on the pretense that a building suitable for military purposes on the Presidio will be suitable for exhibition purposes. It also provides for the appointment of a commissioner from civil life, at a compensation of \$5,000 a year, and that \$50,000 of the \$500,000 shall be available for the entertainment of distinguished persons who are to visit the fair. Although California promised never to ask for a dollar, pledged its sacred honor by resolution of the legislature, by promises of Representatives on the floor of this House, they have obtained \$500,000 for Government exhibits, \$104,000 for the entertainment of officers of visiting fleets at Hampton Roads, Panama, and San Francisco, \$200,000 for United States customs and other officials at the fair, and having thus already obtained \$800,000 in appropriations, it now has the effrontery to try and induce Congress to appropriate \$500,000 more.

I voted for San Francisco as a place to hold the exposition in good faith, and replied upon the statements made. I believe that we should compel the people interested to live up to their pledges. There is no excuse for appropriating this \$500,000. A building that will be suitable for exhibition purposes will be ridiculous and useless as barracks and quarters for troops. This building, if erected, unless it is to be a permanent exhibition building, will have to be destroyed. It will not be suitable for the exposition and also for the Army. It seems to me, in view of the records that have been made, in view of the promises that have been made, in view of the assurances, in view of the action Congress has taken, this Democratic House should not be induced by any specious plea to do anything to relieve the exposition company of its obligations, and appropriate this money. I hope the House will refuse to appropriate the \$500,000. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called the attention of the House to the fact that certain pledges were made at the time Congress adopted the resolution that carried with it the official indorsement of the Government of the United States to the city of San Francisco to hold the Panama-Pacific Exposition to commemorate the completion of the Panama Canal. The city of San Francisco and the State of California made the pledges in good faith. Many things have happened in that State, as they have all over the country, since that time over which the people in California and San Francisco have had no control. Our people intended as far as they were able to carry out their pledges, and have done so.

In the case of permanent buildings the exposition had to forego a number of the permanent buildings contemplated at the time this exposition was first put under way that were intended for the permanent use of the citizens of San Francisco after the exposition closed. Every way in which the company could economize has been taken advantage of, so that every obligation would be fulfilled. We are asking the Congress of the United States at this time to provide \$500,000 for a permanent building, \$450,000 to be used for a permanent building and \$50,000 for the entertainment of distinguished visitors. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations states that it is hardly possible to construct a building to house the Government's exhibit that will be suitable for the purposes of the War Department after the exposition closes. I call your attention to the Senate amendment, which provides—

That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

It is not within the province of the exposition company to say where it shall be located, what its design shall be, but it is for the Secretary of War to select a location and approve the design for War Department purposes, for barracks and quarters to be used by one of the greatest military reservations the United States has after the exposition closes. This is not the ordinary appropriation for exposition purposes. The building is to be of a permanent character, owned by the United States and placed on the Government reservation.

The Secretary of War will have entire jurisdiction over the location and the plans and designs of that structure. It is not likely that the Secretary of War, after appearing before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, favoring this appropriation, is going to permit the War Department to be used for an ulterior purpose. It not only has the indorsement of the Secretary of War, but has the indorsement of the Secretary of State, and a special message was sent to this House by the President of the United States favoring this appropriation, and the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has reported that bill favorably, and it is now pending on the calendar. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says that space has been allotted for the Government exhibit in different parts of the exposition grounds. Is national pride not to be taken into consideration in this matter? When the people of this country and the people of the world go to visit San Francisco in 1915, is not the Nation in duty bound to provide a suitable place for its exhibit, as well as to provide a suitable exhibit? The exposition company is doing all it possibly can. Conditions have not been of the very best since 1907. When we were about recovering from the disaster of 1906 the panic of 1907 came along, and when we got the official sanction of the Government to hold the exposition we were hopeful that financial and industrial conditions would be so good that the people of the city and State would respond as Californians always do. Unfortunately the opposite has been the case, and the company and the people generally have contributed as generously as present conditions will permit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, was not public pride just as great when we made the original appropriation as it is now?

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Yes; but conditions have changed, as I have stated. Otherwise this and other appropriations would not have been asked. In this instance the Government of the United States is asking Congress to act.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman to tell me what those conditions are. I voted for this original proposition with the idea that no money was to be appropriated, and I will probably vote for this, but I would like to know what the change is.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. The Secretary of War has stated that this building can be used for Government purposes, and it is intended it shall be used for Government purposes, and the plans and designs for that building will be such that the War

Department, at a small cost, will have suitable accommodations for the Army at the Presidio Military Reservation.

Nearly all of the foreign Governments, with the exception of England and Germany, have accepted our invitation to participate at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, for the purpose of celebrating the completion of the Panama Canal, and in every instance have made an appropriation, not alone for an exhibit but for an appropriate building characteristic of the country itself and its arts and industries, and also to house the exhibits of its citizens.

Over 30 States of this Union have accepted the invitation to participate; have selected their sites; made appropriations for suitable buildings, which are now in course of construction.

Why should we, as a nation, when we invite the world to participate, hesitate about making an appropriation for a suitable building in which to house our exhibit so that Americans generally when they visit the exposition might take pride in their own participation?

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State, realizing that this Nation should be suitably represented, have asked Congress in this instance to act. Notwithstanding the statements of some of the gentlemen on the floor that promises were made that no appropriations should be asked for, the Chief Executive, understanding the situation, has given his approval to the proposition now before the House.

The military reservation of San Francisco will derive benefits in the way of permanent improvements that will save this Government hundreds of thousands of dollars, not alone in the filling in of lands, the estimated cost of which was \$300,000, but in the permanent beautification of the grounds in the matter of parks, flower beds, beautiful trees, and well-built roads. All these improvements will be permanent and remain the property of the Government after the exposition closes.

It should be borne in mind that this is not the usual exposition appropriation for a temporary building which will be torn down, but has for its purpose a building of a permanent character, under the control and direction of the Secretary of War, that will be used for military purposes.

The Government of the United States should lead the way for the other nations of the earth, and it would have been a great stimulus to this exposition if this course had been followed. Our action up to date has proven more harmful than helpful to the success of the exposition. It has resulted in other nations being slow to take part, and in at least one instance has resulted in one of the nations refusing to participate at all.

These discussions on the floor of the House are not helpful, and instead of boosting this great exposition will do a great deal of harm. I trust that at this late day the House of Representatives will make up for whatever negligence we might have shown in the past by adopting the motion of my colleague [Mr. KAHN] to concur in the Senate amendment and provide for this permanent building, which shall be used during the exposition period to house the Government exhibit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this appropriation, but I take occasion now to call the attention of the House to the fact that in addition to a glorious climate and a few native sons, California produces the best bunch of liars that I ever knew. I say this, of course, in an impersonal sense. I happened to be a Member of the House in 1911, when the contest waged between my city of New Orleans and San Francisco took place, and I recall with distinctness the iteration and reiteration of the fact that California and San Francisco were quite self-sufficient, that they needed no Government aid and they wanted no Government aid, and that neither at that time nor at any future time would they ask for Government aid. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that up to the present time \$800,000 have been appropriated by the Federal Government to assist in this fair, and now \$500,000 more are asked, making, in all, \$1,300,000. When we from Louisiana came here with a naked, plain, straight-out proposition, saying that we wanted \$1,000,000, we were told by gentlemen who voted for San Francisco that they were voting for San Francisco because no Government appropriation would be asked for or accepted, and yet these gentlemen from California are here exceeding our request made three years ago by \$300,000.

I can well believe, Mr. Speaker, that the two great universities on the Pacific slope—Berkeley and Palo Alto—have created a chair for the special purpose of promoting the gentle art of mendacity.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana yields back two minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions at the time San Francisco was selected as the place to hold the exposition to commemorate the opening of the Panama Canal. It is true that the representatives of San Francisco made a proposal to Congress and to that committee which did not contemplate that there should be a Government exhibit or a building. That was not a part of their proposition. Their proposition was simply that when the President should be satisfied that a corporation under the laws of the State of California had been organized and had \$15,000,000 at its disposal for the purpose of inaugurating and carrying on an exposition for this purpose, then an invitation to all of the nations and peoples of the world should be extended to come and participate in the exposition.

The proposition of New Orleans was that the United States Government should inaugurate the exposition and should contribute \$1,000,000 as provided in that bill. I should have voted for San Francisco even if their bill had carried a provision for a Government exhibit. I want to correct the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ]. I do not think it is fair to say that the representatives from San Francisco and California have been guilty of mendacity in this matter. If you examine the hearings before the committee at the time these representations were made, you will observe that they said they did not ask and would not ask that the Government of the United States should either have a Government exhibit there or a Government building for that exhibit. They did not say, and it was brought out in the discussion that they would oppose the Government having an exhibit or a building, and, in fact, some one, I think, made the remark during those hearings that the Government of the United States could not very well honorably abstain from having an exhibit at an exposition to participate in which they invited all of the other nations of the world. That was in 1911. We passed the resolution that San Francisco proposed, and afterwards, two years later, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions brought in a bill to provide for an expensive commission, as the gentleman from New York has said, and for a \$2,000,000 appropriation, to aid in carrying on the exposition. I opposed that most strenuously, because I thought it was a violation of the spirit of the proposal made by San Francisco, and it was not necessary. However, there was nothing in what San Francisco did or said or promised which prevented the United States Government from having an exhibit there if they wanted to. This is an industrial exposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman not recall that in his previous speech he quoted Mr. Scott, the head of the exposition company, as saying that he would not take the exhibit?

Mr. STEENERSON. I know what I said.

Mr. SHERLEY. He would not take it if they gave it to him.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, they could not prevent the Government of the United States from exhibiting at an exposition. We must remember that the United States Government, in addition to its regular Government work, is one of the greatest industrial institutions in the world, carrying on forestry and irrigation; we are making cannon and ammunition and carrying on factories in almost every line of industry, and this being an exposition of an industrial character, it is appropriate that the United States should take part in it and have an exhibit. Two years after the proposal of San Francisco was made, the United States Congress, whether with or without the request of San Francisco, or California, appropriated for a Government exhibit. Congress had the right to provide for a Government exhibit, and did so in the sundry civil bill a year ago. I do not think much weight should be given to the argument that San Francisco promised not to ask for a Government exhibit. That fact should not and did not prevent us from having one, if we saw fit to do so. Manifestly, Congress thought that it would not be proper to be unrepresented at an exposition to which it invited other nations and which was to commemorate one of the greatest events in history, a triumph of peace and industry and not of war. Over a year ago provision for a suitable Government exhibit was made.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?
Mr. STEENERSON. No; I decline to yield now.

The question now comes up on the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill, which contains an item appropriating \$500,000 for the construction of buildings at the Presidio in San Francisco which can be used temporarily for the housing of the Government exhibit and afterwards permanently as barracks and buildings suitable for that military post.

I am advised that the Secretary of War strongly favors the proposition, that the present buildings used for the troops are in poor condition and would have to be discarded within a year or two, anyway, and that by a comparatively very slight expense the buildings proposed to be built could be made to suit the purposes of the War Department after the exposition is ended.

Although, as I have stated, I opposed the \$2,000,000 appropriation, I shall vote in favor of the present item. As the event we are to celebrate—the completion of the Panama Canal—draws near, it is natural that we should all feel a just pride in the great achievement. It is an event that swells the heart of every patriotic citizen. It is an event that fills with enthusiasm every friend of civilization throughout the whole world. The interest of the people of the world is constantly growing. I am advised that applications for space at the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco are so numerous that it will be impossible to fill them, only in part. When we made the appropriation a year ago for the Government exhibit we provided that suitable buildings for the housing of all said exhibits shall be provided by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. without expense of any kind to the Government of the United States, and that company, I am informed, is ready and willing to provide the buildings, but that if the Government would provide these buildings in the manner indicated it would give them much more space for other exhibits and would aid greatly in making the exposition even a greater success than it otherwise would be. I think, therefore, that as reasonable men we ought to take into consideration and account the changed situation, the changed circumstances. In view of these circumstances it seems to me we ought to favor this item and appropriate this additional \$500,000 for the erection of these buildings, which may be used by the exposition for the Government exhibit and afterwards as permanent structures for the War Department. I believe thoroughly in holding people to their word, especially in the matter of expositions, for our experiences in the past have not always been satisfactory; but I do not think it fair to accuse the people of San Francisco of bad faith. The Chief Executive recommended Government participation. This proposition for a building comes favorably recommended by the State Department. The committee, through a sense of fitness of things, brings forward this measure of their own accord, and it seems to me under all the circumstances that we can well afford to support the modest appropriation for these buildings which will in the course of time be of permanent use to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are beginning to regard the Congress somewhat in the light of gypsy horse traders, and twice in my experience here I have myself been cheated. A number of years ago we increased the salary of the President of the United States to \$75,000 a year on the positive assurance of the gentlemen who were back of the proposition that that would cover mileage, salary, and all, as was then being expended as salary and mileage. In the next Congress the same gentlemen who insisted the presidential salary bill meant a total of \$75,000 brought in another bill providing for \$25,000 for mileage for the President. I voted for the \$75,000 proposition and got flimmed. Some years later the gentlemen from California proposed that the Panama exposition be sent to San Francisco, and with much eloquence and with forceful assurance, to me at least, they captured the exposition for San Francisco largely on the theory that San Francisco was going to pay all the expense. I voted for San Francisco under those conditions, and now in another Congress we are told that we are not responsible for what promises were made in other Congresses, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the United States most certainly remember those promises, and we certainly ought to keep faith with the same. I believe the proposition ought to be voted down.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have never been overenthusiastic in the matter of international expositions, and I will

suffer no particular sorrow when the custom of holding these expositions passes. But I remember that I was moved once before sentimentally in this body on account of San Francisco, and I am willing to be moved in that splendid city's behalf in the same way to-day. It is a little less than 10 years ago that San Francisco was stricken by an earthquake—

Mr. KAHN. Less than eight years ago.

Mr. MURDOCK. Less than eight years ago—a disaster which appealed to the sympathy of the Nation and met immediate response in Congress. San Francisco has done a wonderful thing since, a thing which is not paralleled in the history of the world, in building itself up, a greater, finer, better city than before. The exposition is to be a crowning achievement. The men who came here at the time of the contest between the two cities which sought the exposition and made promises that they would not ask for governmental aid did a foolish thing. So far as I am concerned they did not deceive me. Despite their promises I knew the request for aid would come, and I am willing to vote to-day for the Government to build a structure there worthy of the Government, and for this further reason—I have read in the last six or eight months repeatedly in the cable dispatches instances where foreign Governments asked to make exhibits are hanging back. The Panama Exposition at San Francisco consequently has had, within the knowledge of everyone here, a hard row to hoe. Now, we can not expect other Governments to appropriate money to take part in that exposition if we as a Government hang back ourselves. Certainly the event of opening the canal is one worthy of a fitting celebration, and this Government ought not to stint the exposition so far as it is concerned. This appropriation, in my opinion, ought to be made regardless of promises which have been made by the officials of that exposition in the past.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will.

Mr. FALCONER. Does the gentleman figure that a provision for a permanent building that the Government needs there is in any way in conflict with the promises made by the delegation from California several years ago?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I should say yes, but regardless of the promises, this Government ought to erect a suitable building at San Francisco. Now, I have quite a record in Congress on expositions. I voted under protest for the \$4,600,000 as a loan to St. Louis, and my protest was based on the fear that St. Louis would never pay the money back. St. Louis did pay the money back and if I had to vote on the proposition over again I should again cast my vote for St. Louis, and that without hesitation. We ought not to be too hard on our terms in a matter in which the whole Nation is concerned before the world. I believe this appropriation should be passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this progressiveness is shocking. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, my vote in favor of San Francisco as against New Orleans was secured by the promise of the representatives from California that they never would ask or accept a dollar from the United States, a promise not made vaguely, but made definitely, precisely, and it has been quoted here by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Now, to have such a proposition as this come before the House makes me feel as if I had been defrauded and my vote had been secured by false pretenses and I certainly can not participate in that fraud. I am not disposed to criticize or feel harshly toward the Representatives from California here. I appreciate their delicate position. I appreciate that they must consider public sentiment at home and, therefore, as I say, I feel leniently toward them. I feel they are in a different position from the rest of us, that they have to represent their people, and are advocates and not judges, but I think all the rest of this House, everybody who sits in a judicial capacity and who votes as he thinks is right, stultifies himself if he votes for a proposition like this.

They said they would not ask for a dollar. They have already had \$800,000, and now they are asking for \$500,000 more. And the argument of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], it seems to me, was so specious that I do not see how he could even deceive himself. The United States, of course, can offer this appropriation, but we all know the initiative and pressure brought upon the House for every one of these appropriations was from California, and it was not any voluntary offer of the United States to do it. And therefore, after the promises so specifically made, it seems to me that it is shameful and shameless for California now to ask this contribution.

The proposition that the building is for a barracks is obviously a mere subterfuge and evasion. A building costing

\$500,000 for exposition purposes will either be not good enough for the exposition or it will be too good for a barracks. If the United States wants permanent barracks, let us build them; but let us not deceive ourselves or be deceived by the pretense that this is not a plain proposition to do what we were told we never would be asked to do, and a repudiation of the pledge which caused many of us originally to vote in favor of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used four minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was originally before the House I voted for New Orleans. There is no question here, it seems to me, involving the gentlemen from California. This is not a request upon their part, nor does it come from the city of San Francisco or the State of California. In 1911, Mr. Speaker, we passed a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to invite foreign nations to participate in that exposition. We thereby committed ourselves to this project, say what we please about it. These foreign nations are to take part; they are constructing their buildings, and it would be a reflection on the honor of this Government if we did not make some sort of exposition of our Government affairs and resources at that place.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] says it is a mere subterfuge. I can not believe that the Secretary of War would make himself a party to a subterfuge. He has gone before the committee and has stated that in the course of a very short time, at best, we will be forced to erect barracks on the Presidio; that the present buildings are nothing more than soup houses; that a building can be erected for this purpose; and that the only loss to the Government would be the use of the building during this exposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States have asked Congress to make a fit appropriation commensurate with the dignity of this Government and the great event to be celebrated at that exposition. It is not any sharp practice, it is not a question of deceit, and I am amazed that gentlemen stand upon this floor and attack Representatives from the State of California who do not ask it for themselves or for their people, but it comes as a request of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of War, and we ought to grant it in order to preserve our honor among the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this appropriation. If I am able to determine the nature of a contract, the State of California, two or three years ago, when they were seeking to get this exposition, made a solemn contract with the Government of the United States, and that contract was that if you would give the exposition to the city of San Francisco the time would never come when they would ask the Government of the United States for one dollar. You can not twist the English language to mean anything else. That was the bold, bald, emphatic statement made by what I supposed then and suppose now to be the accredited spokesmen for the State of California, and the entire West, where they wanted this exposition held. On the strength of that statement, in my mind and my judgment there is not a shadow of doubt but that the resolution was carried. You can call this thing what you will, but it is an adjunct of the exposition. That is all it is and that is all it is intended for. And after having come upon the floor of the House, in a strenuous fight led by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], to hold this exposition at San Francisco, with Mr. Rodenberg, of Illinois, leading the fight for New Orleans, finally sufficient votes were secured upon these promises to hold that exposition at San Francisco. Now, does this later request come with very good grace? I do not criticize anybody, but I put it squarely to the gentleman from California if it comes with very good grace to appear before the Congress of the United States, after having made the statement that you never would take a dollar, and after receiving \$800,000, that you first said you would never ask for, and request this appropriation of \$500,000 more? I do not believe it does; and I do not think this amendment ought to carry. It ought to be overwhelmingly defeated in order to teach people to stand up to their contracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it seems to me the question of what was said in the debate when the original resolution was passed ought not to be considered now. I think everybody recognizes and realizes that at present that resolu-

tion, so far as the vote was concerned, stands where it was thought it was going to be before all the pulling of eagle feathers occurred on the floor of the House. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that any statement made by any Member of the delegation from California did not have relation or refer to the Government itself participating in this exposition. Here is the question of a building to be erected for the War Department on Government land to be used only for a few months by the exposition for the purpose, not of the exposition, not for California, not for San Francisco, but for the United States Government, that it may exemplify the kind and character of this Government. Our history—

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. In just a moment. It is to be erected so that it may exemplify the principles on which this Government was founded, the Declaration of Independence, and all those things that relate to it; that they might be placed there in this exposition, and, in addition to that, exhibits showing our material advancement, so that civilized peoples of the world may come to the Government building and see what has been done by the United States.

The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions had under consideration a similar bill to the provisions now under consideration in this bill.

The bill was prepared in conference with Secretary Bryan, of the State Department, and Secretary Garrison, of the War Department, and meets with their approval, and the same was sent to the committee by the two Secretaries. The Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions reported favorably on the bill H. R. 16327, which is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16327) to provide an appropriation for the erection of a building within which to install a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the said Government Exhibit Board created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, properly to install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to erect, by contract or otherwise, a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio, at a cost not to exceed \$500,000, in which to install, display, and safeguard the said exhibits of the Government of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the said building shall be so planned and of such permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design as shall be approved by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of War.

The provisions of the present bill are as follows:

PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Building to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition: For the construction of a suitable building in that part of the reservation of the United States known as the Presidio of San Francisco, State of California, in which the Government Exhibit Board, created by the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, shall install, display, and safeguard the exhibit of the Government of the United States at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, \$500,000: *Provided*, That the said building shall be so located and planned and shall be of such a permanent character as will make it available and useful for military purposes of the United States after the close of the said exposition, and shall be on such general plan and design and in such location as shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the said building shall be erected under the authority of the Secretary of War, by contract or otherwise, as he may direct: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended from the appropriation made herein, on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, for entertaining the officers and representatives of foreign Governments who may attend and participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in consequence of the invitation of the President of the United States, extended in pursuance of the authority of Congress.

The provisions contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914," which provides for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, be amended as follows: Under the head of "To provide for the participation of the United States in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition," the paragraph on page 81, which reads as follows: "The President of the United States is authorized to detail three civilian officers or employees from the executive departments as members of a commission which is hereby constituted as the National Exposition Commission, one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner shall receive in addition to his original compensation his actual necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu of subsistence. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerical, office, and other necessary and actual expenses of said commission," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The President of the United States is authorized to detail two civilian officers or employees from the executive departments, also one to be appointed from civil life, as members of the commission which is hereby constituted as the national exposition commission; one of said commissioners, who shall be the chairman of said commission, shall be detailed from the Department of State, the commissioner appointed from civil life to receive a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum until the exposition closes. Vacancies in said commission shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Each commissioner detailed as aforesaid shall receive, in addition to his original compensation, necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of \$10 per day in lieu

of subsistence while on duty in San Francisco. Said commissioners may appoint a secretary at \$2,500 per annum, and the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended for clerk hire and actual expenses of said commission."

The objects and purposes of the bill reported by the House Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has for its object the same purpose as this amendment. This amendment is more extensive and in detail, and gives some additional legislation. A year ago an appropriation of \$500,000 for the preparation of a Government exhibit at this exposition was made, and ever since that time the work of preparing such an exhibit has been going on under the auspices of the officials designated by the President. That the United States should make a suitable exhibit is self-evident. This country has extended an invitation to foreign powers to participate in this world exposition, and being the host of all foreign countries and all foreigners who bring to this land their wares, arts, and methods of education, and of all who may attend the exposition, therefore it is certainly incumbent upon the United States to do its part.

On April 2, 1914, President Wilson sent a message to the Congress, transmitting the statement of the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation for the erection of a building on the Presidio grounds in which to install the Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. The message of the President and the statement of Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State, are as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending an appropriation of \$500,000 for the erection of a building within which to install, display, and safeguard at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco the Government exhibit authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913.

As pointed out by the Secretary of State, many of the Governments, officially invited guests by the United States to participate in the exposition, are erecting buildings within which to house their exhibits at the exposition. The Government of the United States should not be behind these in appropriately providing for its national exhibit.

I commend the recommendation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1914.

THE PRESIDENT:

The sundry civil appropriation act approved June 23, 1913, appropriates \$500,000 for the purpose of inaugurating, installing, maintaining, and returning a Government exhibit at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to open at San Francisco next year, of such articles and materials as illustrate the functions and administrative faculty of the Government of the United States tending to demonstrate the nature and growth of our institutions, their adaptation to the wants of the people, and the progress of the Nation in the arts of peace and war; and authorized the President to provide for the collection and exhibition of such articles and materials under the direction of a board which is created by the act, to which is imposed the duty of determining the nature and character and extent of the exhibits to be made and which is charged with the collection, purchase, preparation, safe-keeping, and exhibition and return of such articles and materials as the board may decide shall be exhibited. But no provision is made by that act or by any previous or subsequent act for the erection of a suitable building within which these exhibits may be installed, displayed, and safeguarded.

The policy of the Federal Government to support the exposition was fixed by the joint resolution of February 15, 1911, which requested the President of the United States to invite all the nations of the earth to participate therein, and the invitation extended in pursuance thereof by the President to all the nations of the earth to take part in the exposition gives to the exposition in the minds of the foreign Governments an official character.

Twenty-seven of these Governments have responded favorably to the invitation, most of which have buildings in course of construction in which to house their exhibits, while many of our States have signified their intention to take a worthy part in the exposition, and have made provision for the erection of State buildings. Of the Governments which have not yet accepted the invitation, few have actually declined, while others are awaiting the assembling of their legislative bodies for appropriate action.

I deem it important that the Government of the United States should make at the exposition such a display as will be commensurate with the international scope and importance of the exposition and as will comport with the dignity and standing of the United States. This can not be done, and the exhibit would be of little value if scattered through the exposition buildings, space in which I understand is already insufficient for individual exhibitors. To be imposing it should be collected together under one roof. The site set apart for the building is on the Government reservation in the Presidio. A building there erected by the Government could no doubt be utilized after the exposition for Army uses and it should be constructed with that end in view.

The sum of \$500,000 is not too large for this purpose, and I recommend that Congress be requested to appropriate that amount for the erection of the building.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. BRYAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1914.

A building of the character contemplated by this amendment ought to be erected at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Twenty-seven foreign Governments have accepted the invitation of the President to participate in this exposition. Each of these Governments will construct a building for the housing of its exhibits. The Government of the United States being

the host at this exposition, it is eminently proper that the United States should also have a building wherein its exhibits can be displayed to the best possible advantage. Unless a building such as is contemplated by this amendment is constructed the exhibits of the United States Government will be scattered through many buildings, and the very object and purpose of assembling the Government exhibit so that it may be an object lesson to our visitors from abroad, as well as to the citizens from all over the United States, will not be attained.

At the exhibitions that have been held heretofore the Government display has invariably been one of the chief attractions. The exhibit contemplated by the commission authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act of June 23, 1913, will be the most comprehensive and instructive that has ever been displayed by the United States at any exposition. The Government exhibit should not be scattered through a half dozen buildings. It would be very unfortunate if they had to be thus scattered. The people of the United States should be able to see and view the many attractions in which the Government is engaged, and those attractions and works should be exhibited at one place and under one building and in the most comprehensive and instructive manner. They can be arrayed to a much better advantage when grouped together in one building. Otherwise many of them will be lost sight of by a large number of the visitors, and one of the chief objects and purposes of the Government exhibit will be destroyed.

Nearly all of the States of the Union have accepted an invitation to participate, and will construct their own buildings to house their exhibits and provide places of assembly for the people of the various States. This will be in addition to the exhibits of foreign Governments.

The building contemplated by this amendment will be of a permanent character and will be so constructed that it can be used by the War Department when the exposition is over. It will be placed on the Government property on what is known as the Presidio. The Secretary of War, in speaking of the construction of this building when he appeared before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions of the House pointed out that he believed a proper building for exposition purposes could be so constructed that after the close of the exposition it would be easily and inexpensively converted into a barracks. His statement before the committee of the House, in part, is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I was out at San Francisco on an inspection tour this summer, I found that while some of our buildings at the Presidio were in good condition and were suitable for the purpose for which they were being used, there was a great number of buildings there, which we had to use under the circumstances, which were entirely unfit. Many of them had been temporarily erected at the time of the Philippine troubles, when we were having great numbers of troops, and since that time they have been patched up and kept in use, but they are really not such buildings as should be used for housing troops or for other governmental purposes.

They endeavored to enlist me—and very properly—in an attempt to have the Presidio present an appearance to the visitors who would come to the exposition which would be a credit to the military branch of the Government, and, of course, to the Government itself. I told them that I did not feel justified in asking for a direct appropriation in the Army bill, except for enough money to put into such shape as we could the existing buildings and to fix up the offices and other things that would necessarily have to be used. I therefore asked for no extra appropriation for this purpose in the Army bill and none was granted. Out of what was granted, such an allotment was made, under due administrative procedure, as was thought proper by the Quartermaster General, and that will be placed at the disposal of the commander of that department and will be utilized to paint these old buildings and repair them where they have gone into disrepair, and generally make the Presidio as presentable as possible.

The question was then taken up about the necessity, from the standpoint of those who had the interests of the Government at heart, of a building specifically to house the Government exhibits. I told them I had no concern with that, except as an intellectual concern—none as an official—and if they could get the department of the Government that was concerned to recommend it, I would take such interest in it as was proper. They said if they could get the Department of State and the President interested and show them the desirability of the United States Government doing that which, I think, 26 or 27 other Governments were doing, namely, have a building of their own, they would arrange to put this building on the Presidio and erect it under our supervision and make it so that we could convert it into some useful Army purpose. If they can be so built as to be changed into barracks, it would be of immense advantage to the Government, and really would be no loss whatever. Its use during the period of the exposition would be the only loss to the War Department.

It is absolutely necessary sometime to erect barracks there for one regiment, because they are now living in most curious buildings. They look like soup kitchens temporarily turned into living apartments. They are long, low frame buildings, built of cheap lumber, and I think it is only the splendid climate that enable them to stand as long as they have. I do not think in our climate here they would have stood so long. They are technically called cantonments, because they are all in long rows.

Mr. HAMLIN. You spoke of "them" making certain recommendations. To whom do you refer?

Secretary GARRISON. I refer to the officials of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition—the president, Mr. Moore, and I do not recall the name of the other gentleman—who particularly enlisted my attention.

Mr. HAMLIN. The reason I ask that question is that the statement was made that San Francisco was not asking this.

Secretary GARRISON. At the time I was there, as I now recall it, the mayor of San Francisco was absent.

Mr. HAMLIN. The parties in charge of the exposition spoke to you?

Secretary GARRISON. Yes; they came to me.

Mr. KAHN. I have not spoken to you about this matter.

Secretary GARRISON. No, sir; not in any way. Now, to continue what I was going to say: If this building can be so constructed that by the expenditure of a very inconsiderable amount of money—and perhaps it could be saved out of the initial appropriation—it could be turned into a barracks, then there is no question but that it is an economical and wise and proper thing for the Government to do, providing it wishes to initially have that sort of a building there for exhibition purposes. Of course, if you give me \$500,000 to build a barracks, I will do it immediately, because it is needed. If you do it in this indirect way, it would be just as beneficial to the Army.

I would send for the Quartermaster and the Chief of Engineers, and I would say, "Gentlemen, you have \$500,000. Can you construct a building for exhibition purposes to be used during the exposition, and, with no structural change—only interior changes—convert it into a barracks afterwards?" And I would take their judgment in the matter.

Mr. FRANCIS. If it is not completed in the way contemplated, is it your opinion that an appropriation would have to be asked for it soon from the War Department?

Secretary GARRISON. Oh, yes. You can not go on with the Presidio for many more years without erecting a barracks for Infantry. You must have them there for the Pacific coast. I just ordered a brigade there that was on the border. Their present cantonments are very inadequate for the purpose.

The present plan is to erect, as nearly as possible, one building for our barracks, following out the idea of the continental countries, where they get a whole regiment where we have our officers' quarters. It is perfectly amazing, for we have 8 and 10 miles covering some of our military posts. They have to be kept up. Sewer pipes have to be put down and gas pipes and all that sort of thing, and the present conception of that is to keep these things—if we can build a barracks and house a regiment—on a half acre of ground, instead of spreading it over an acre and a half of ground. It is not a matter of ground that makes the difference, but it is these accessories, and of course those are expensive things. The upkeep is an expensive thing. It is not the initial investment but the constant upkeep.

I am rather inclined to think, with this modern conception, the Quartermaster General and the Chief of Engineers could suggest a building with that money which could afterwards be converted into a barracks for practically a whole regiment—probably for eight companies, and then spend a small amount of money for the other four companies. My own opinion is, if this was spent under our direction, the Army would get a very practical benefit from it, because when they got the exhibits out it would be a mere matter of removing the partitions. In all these modern barracks the rooms are low and there are places in the center for the gun racks. The partitions could be removed or additional partitions could be put up if the room was too large.

We are trying to concentrate everything, and instead of having a lot of these little cantonments we are trying to put up one substantial building, mostly of some kind of concrete, and housing just as many men as we can under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

It is conceded on all hands that it is absolutely necessary to erect a barracks on the Presidio at San Francisco for one regiment. The present buildings are old, inadequate, wooden structures, built of cheap lumber, and if it were not for the splendid climate of California they would probably not have been able to stand as long as they have. It is further conceded that it will be impossible to go on many years more as they have without erecting a barracks for the Infantry at the Presidio.

The construction of the building contemplated by this amendment will be in line with the policy of building by the War Department in recent years, to put up one substantial structure and house just as many men as can be housed under the one roof, because that saves in utility and upkeep.

The fact that the buildings that are used at present for the barracks by the enlisted men at the Presidio are entirely inadequate for the purposes for which they are being used—and the construction of the building authorized by this amendment will meet a useful and permanent purpose—there should be no question or doubt on the part of any Member of the House in voting for this amendment.

This legislation is recommended by the President of the United States, by the Secretary of State, and by the War Department, and surely after such investigation by the administration and those in charge of this kind of work and the needs and necessities of such a building the House should unanimously recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is to be a Government work, necessary and permanent. It will enable the proper display of the Government's exhibit and attractions, and then after a few months' use can and will be readily converted into quarters for the Army stationed at the Presidio.

From every consideration and from every viewpoint it is a question of economy in the long run; and that being the case, every Member should feel that he is doing the right thing when he casts his vote for the amendment.

I sincerely trust that the Senate amendment will be agreed to, to the end that ample provision may be made for construction of this building at this time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the people of California believed they would not require a Government exhibit. It is true they believed they would not require a dollar from the Federal Treasury. But some months after Congress decided that San Francisco should be the place where the exposition to commemorate the completion of the Panama Canal should be held 17 of the powers of Europe sent commissioners who met in the city of Berlin and agreed upon an exposition treaty. The terms of that treaty were such that unless a Government exhibit were made by us practically all of Europe would be absent from this exposition at San Francisco. Those facts came to the knowledge of the exposition company and created consternation. And because those facts stared the Government of the United States in the face the President sent a message asking for a Government exhibit.

That is how the matter came before this House. Then Congress voted for a Government exhibit. It was to be spread through all the buildings of the exposition.

Personally I had no objection to that; but the Secretary of War believes, and the men who are on the exposition board believe, that it would be better to have all of the exhibits of the Government under one roof. I spoke with one of them this morning, and he told me that it would be much better to have the exhibits under one roof in a Government building.

Practically every civilized country in the world will have a building at the exposition at San Francisco. England and Germany are the two notable exceptions. On the floor of the House of Commons, when Sir Edward Grey was asked why England was not going to participate, he said that this Government had done nothing for the exposition at San Francisco, and for that reason he did not see any reason why England should be called upon to be represented there. That is what we have had to face.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield just now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KAHN. I would like to yield to my friend, but I have only 14 minutes. If I can get more time, I will gladly yield.

Japan is putting up a building with an exhibit at a cost of \$600,000. France is putting up a building with exhibits to cost \$400,000. China will put in a building and an exhibit at a cost of half a million dollars. The commissioners of the Argentine Republic are in this city to-day, and they announce that the Argentine Republic is spending \$1,150,000 for a building and an exhibit. Italy, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and even little Switzerland will have beautiful Government pavilions. All of Central and South America will have buildings; and nearly every State in the Union will have its own State building.

Now, this proposed Government building is to be a permanent building for the Army, and the Secretary of War authorized me to say upon this floor and upon his responsibility that the building is needed, and that such a building can be constructed.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I regret that I can not yield. Their purpose, as I understand it, is to put up the frame at this time and later on complete the interior of the building. The Presidio of San Francisco is a three-regiment infantry post. At the present time there are decent barracks there for one and one-half regiments. The other barracks are mere whitewashed shacks, put up during the Spanish-American War; they were not even constructed by skilled mechanics. They were put up by the soldiers themselves. They are whitewashed temporary quarters, a disgrace to the Government of the United States. The Secretary of War stated before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions that in any other climate they would have had to be abandoned long ago. These buildings that it is proposed to pull down are in the exposition grounds. I have pictures—photographs—of them. They are, as I said a moment ago, a disgrace to the Government of the United States.

Now, let me tell you some of the things that the exposition company has done for the Government in the Presidio. For years estimates have been sent to Congress by the War Department asking that a certain marsh on the northern end of the Presidio be filled in. The estimates, as I now recall, were for \$300,000. That work has been done by the exposition company. They have given to this Government \$300,000 worth of work that the Government needed in that one spot alone. They have laid out a magnificent parade ground for the Government of the United States. The exposition company paid for it. It does not cost the Government a dollar. They have laid out magnificent parks and roads and parterres, where shrubbery has been planted; they have set out beautiful trees on the Presidio

grounds. They have beautified the Presidio of San Francisco in a way that this Government never would have done, probably, or would not have done for years. The work that the exposition company has done is probably worth \$400,000 to the Government of the United States.

Now, if this proposed building were simply to be torn down when the exposition is over, if it were not to be a permanent building, perhaps there would be good reason why it should not be constructed. But it is to be a permanent building. It is to house the soldiers of the United States; and any gentleman who has ever been in the Presidio of San Francisco and has looked upon the whitewashed shacks in which the soldiers now live will realize how important it is to put up decent barracks and quarters for the soldiers who wear the blue.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: If conditions such as he describes have existed, why has not the Secretary of War or the War Department appealed to Congress for relief?

Mr. KAHN. The Secretary of War has done that repeatedly, and the Committee on Appropriations has always turned down the items in the estimates. I can show the gentleman the estimates. They have not been sent down in the last few years, because they got tired of sending them down.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When was the last time?

Mr. KAHN. I do not recall; but I know that the grounds at that time were needed for field artillery maneuvers; but the Congress never provided the funds for filling in the swamp, and it has all been filled in since by the exposition company.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BARNHART. Is it not a matter of fact that the project of constructing this building on the Presidio has been before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for a long time?

Mr. KAHN. It has never been before that committee to my knowledge.

Mr. BARNHART. It has been to my knowledge.

Mr. KAHN. I repeat, it has never been before that committee, and I can not yield any further. It has never been before that committee at any time. It has been before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, because the communications from the President of the United States and the Secretary of State recommending this appropriation were referred to that committee; but the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has never had any jurisdiction whatever of this matter. The gentleman probably has in mind the marine hospital, which is several miles away from the exposition grounds and which has nothing whatever to do with the exposition.

Now, reference has been made to the \$100,000 in the naval appropriation bill and to the \$200,000 for the customhouse. The \$200,000 will come back into the Treasury of the United States, every dollar of it, through the customs revenues that will be collected at the exposition at San Francisco. The \$100,000 for the Navy will not be expended at San Francisco. The great bulk of it will be expended right here and at Hampton Roads. That is where the fleets will come together. That is where the great entertainment is to be. The naval officers of the world's fleet are to call here upon the President of the United States. They are to be entertained here in Washington long before they reach San Francisco, and at Hampton Roads, and the bulk of the money will be expended here and at Hampton Roads; so that those expenses should not be charged up against the exposition. The fleets will go to San Francisco as a finality, but the ships of war are first going to assemble in Hampton Roads, and the money was intended to do the entertaining there. I believe that but a small part of it is to be expended at San Francisco. All that the Congress has appropriated for the exposition is \$500,000 for a Government exhibit.

I have told you under what circumstances that money came to be appropriated. I am now explaining to you why the other \$500,000 is asked for. That has not been asked by the exposition company, so far as I know. It has been asked by the executive officers of this Government. The President of the United States and the Secretary of State recommended it. The Secretary of War himself appeared before one of the committees of this House and pointed out the necessity for it. The Secretary of Commerce on a recent visit to San Francisco realized the necessity for it, and upon his own motion wrote me a strong letter in which he said it was absolutely essential, or

words to that effect, that this building be put up for the honor of the people of the United States.

As far as the directors of the exposition company are concerned, they, as the hosts of the Nation, are going to put up the most magnificent exposition that the world has ever seen. Every American citizen will take pride in it. Every Member of Congress will be proud of what the people of California have done for this Government in planning and executing this superb exposition. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] stated how the people of San Francisco were stricken eight years ago. Their undaunted courage in rehabilitating their city has gained for them the admiration of mankind. But, sir, only two years ago a killing frost in one night destroyed practically the entire citrus fruit crop of the State of California, valued at approximately \$30,000,000. It was a terrific blow to our citizens. Yet the people of that State have gone into their pockets and have put up over \$30,000,000, or will have put it up by the time the exposition doors open, for this undertaking to which the nations of the world have been invited by the President of the United States. No other exposition ever came to Congress for so little as this. St. Louis, in the region in which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] lives, got \$11,600,000. Of this sum \$4,000,000 was paid back, but the balance was practically an outright gift in aid of the exposition. The city of Chicago got nearly \$6,000,000 as an outright gift in aid of the exposition. Yet we have not asked for a dollar and do not intend to ask for a dollar in aid of the exposition itself. What has been asked for has been asked simply because conditions compelled it. If we could have looked into the future, if we could have foreseen the attitude of European nations, we probably never would have made the statements we did. But we made them. We made a mistake, because we could not foresee the future. We did it honestly, we did it sincerely; we are but human, and it is only human to err. But as American citizens you are interested in the success and the excellence of this exposition just as much as we are. I certainly hope that Congress in its wisdom will vote for this building, which is so earnestly needed. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] concludes his eloquent remarks with the statement that San Francisco will never ask anything for aid of the exposition itself. A few years ago that statement would have convinced me that the future would warrant the statement, but unfortunately I recall that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] was even more emphatic and equally eloquent in his promise that they would never ask a cent even for a Government exhibit or any building for that Government exhibit. Why, the gentleman's enthusiasm carried him so far that he said a Government exhibit did not amount to much, anyway.

Mr. KAHN. I thought so.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will put into the Record the language of the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. I said that.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman said that we had gone so far with Government exhibits that there was nothing new in them, that they would go into every State in the Union and get State exhibits; that they were raising their own money and did not want any of Uncle Sam's money. The trouble then was that they were faced with a contest that they thought they were going to lose, and which they would have lost if they had not gotten a new hold and have come here with that promise. It was not definite enough originally to suit them, and they had a subsequent hearing, and then they made it ironclad. Now, I believe in men keeping their word. I believe in communities keeping their word. I believe in States keeping their word; and if we are ever to stop the abuse of obtaining money from the Government under false pretenses we have got to do it now. [Applause.]

If I let my personal feelings for individual members of the California delegation control me here, then I might vote in the affirmative and have the pleasing reflection that I had done something that was pleasing to them.

I say to you now that the very recital of the instances of St. Louis and Chicago shows that we have got to stop now if we are ever to get done with this proposition of helping along every community that wants to have an exposition. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] undertakes to say that because St. Louis got it—in his kindness he adds "St. Louis, near the gentleman's district"—therefore California ought to receive Government aid, and the statement is made here that if this building is not given the Government is going to be disgraced. Why, in point of fact, the exhibit at the San Francisco exposition by the Federal Government will be the best that has ever been made by the Federal Government. I make that statement on the authority of the men who are preparing this ex-

hibit and because this time they were chosen from departments that knew something about the business, and were not chosen simply in order that they might draw a salary and enjoy themselves at the exposition. You are going to have the Atlantic Fleet in San Francisco Harbor. Can there be any naval exhibit that will equal that? You are going to have the Army at the Presidio. Can there be any exposition of the Government's Army activities equal to the actual soldiers and the actual guns; the actual Army itself there?

Now, what has happened? I am not going to take the time to read the statements made by Mr. Scott on behalf of the exposition company or the statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] on behalf of that company, but they would have you believe that this is a spontaneous uprising on the part of the people of America to have this additional sum appropriated. What nonsense. Are we children? Do we not know the men who have been here in Washington for months? Do we not know something of the banquet that was given? Do we not know of the pressure that has been put upon men to vote this thing through? If other men do not know, I know, because they knew I was opposed to it, and I have had many men interested urge me not to make this fight. It is not a personal fight. I am doing what I believe to be my duty because of the promises then made to this House.

Oh, but they say you ought to have all the Government exhibits gathered together. What is the fact about that? The exposition company itself determined that it would be better to have the exhibits according to objects rather than from localities. For instance, they were going to have educational matters put together, so that you would have the effect of comparison. The Government exhibit was arranged to be put around according as the activities of the Government dovetailed into other exhibits. All of a sudden they discovered these exhibits must be grouped in order for the United States to have a creditable exhibit. Then they get the assistance of the Army in order to find some other excuse. Oh, how plausible they have been. First, when the fight was on, nothing was wanted. Then when the fight was won they made the excuse that they had not been able to get foreign Governments to exhibit. Now that the foreign Governments have agreed to exhibit, it is a new excuse. Now they say you must do it because the Army needs a building. If the Army needs a building at the Presidio for Army purposes, let us examine into it as an Army estimate and see to it that the plan is adapted to that purpose, and then appropriate the money, but do not let us be fooled and be made cat's-paws to pull the chestnuts out of the fire.

The Secretary of War comes before the Committee on Expositions and favors this proposition. I never knew a Secretary of War yet who was not anxious to get buildings and appropriations for the Army. And if he can get a \$500,000 building, even if it is not suitable he is that much to the good. As to his knowledge whether the building could or could not be built for the two purposes, I read this statement:

Mr. Koxor. You say if a building like that could be constructed, the exhibits could be housed in it and then it could be ultimately used by you. The question is, can it?

Secretary GARRISON. I do not dare to commit myself on that, because I know nothing about it. That would have to be decided by the Quartermaster General. I would have to take the judgment of some one else.

Further along, the Secretary says:

I would suggest to you, gentlemen, that if you are interested in the question of whether this money could be expended on that reservation in such a way as to be useful, useful to the Army afterwards, that you permit me to send up right now, if you have the time, for the Quartermaster General, and, if necessary, the Chief of Engineers, so that you can find out from them by asking for yourselves. I would find out by asking them, because in such matters I take the advice of men who are experts.

Evidently the committee did not have time, because the experts were not called. Now, we are told that because he appeared before them we should be in favor of it. He did not volunteer; he was asked to come and give his testimony. I have a proper respect for these distinguished gentlemen, but with that respect I think this House knows more about the history of these expositions, about the broken promises, about the faith that has not been kept, about how Congress has been buncoed in the past than all the Cabinet officers put together. [Applause.] Therefore, with all proper and due respect for the distinguished gentlemen, I prefer to follow my own judgment and the record in the case than to follow their recommendation in this matter. Five hundred thousand dollars! Why, we had a fight two years ago, after we had beaten the bill that provided for a commission of seven men and which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXBOOR] declared was the most indefensible proposition ever brought on the floor. They tacked onto the sundry civil appropriation bill an appropriation of a million and a half dollars. We had roll call after roll call,

and, in my judgment, it would have been possible to have defeated the proposal to appropriate anything. But we did not do it, we gave them \$500,000, and it was my understanding then that that was the end of the thing. Now, there seems to be no end—always there is a new excuse, always a new reaching out, always a plausible explanation.

How can the Congress rely on statements, what shall it take, what assurance has it now that we will not have to pay the debts of the exposition company on the ground that conditions were not what they expected, and therefore they are in a different position? Certainly not the statements made by the gentlemen on the floor to-day, because statements made by the same gentlemen on the same floor other days have not estopped them or the exposition company from coming here and asking for the money. I repeat that if Congress is going to have any respect for itself, if it is going to have any respect for the promises made to it, it must stand up now.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is the gentleman from Kentucky in favor of the Government exhibit at San Francisco?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is beside the question, because the exhibition has been prepared and provided for. I was in favor of it, but I thought then and think now that San Francisco owes it to her own self-respect, to put it mildly, to pay all the expense of that exhibit.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does the gentleman take the position that the citizens of San Francisco should pay for the National Government exhibit?

Mr. SHERLEY. I take the position that if I obtain something of value on my promises, if I am an honorable man I will keep my promises. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is not the exposition in commemoration of the completion of the Panama Canal?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but we have had expositions and commemorations of everything under the sun. What is the trouble about foreign Governments exhibiting? Is it because Uncle Sam is hesitating about furnishing money because of the promises that have been made? No; it is because the world is sick and tired of being buncoed in the matter of these expositions.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Foreign governments have agreed to exhibit, and it may be that they find it profitable.

Mr. SHERLEY. They perhaps have the same sort of pressure brought to bear on them over there that we have here. I know something about legislative bodies, and they are pretty much the same the world over. The proposition here is, Are you going to let them bunco you the second time? They broke their promise when they secured the exposition at San Francisco; they broke it when they came back and got \$500,000. Read the act that Congress passed. It provided that the exposition company should furnish the building or buildings to house the exhibit. If they wanted all the Government exhibit in one building, they had the opportunity right there. It was their right to have it determined and they determined it. The exhibits have been made up on that theory. Now, all of a sudden somebody discovers that that will not do, that we must have it all in one building at the expense of half a million dollars. The gentleman from Kansas says that he has been moved by sentiment for the great city of San Francisco. We all have admiration of that city's history in connection with its great disaster. But I do not like this sentiment at this time; it is too expensive, about half a million per sentiment. I am in favor of getting to the time where we may have faith kept. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired, all time has expired, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays 109, answered "present" 6, not voting 206, as follows:

YEAS—112.

Allen	Broussard	Curry	Falconer
Ansberry	Bryan	DeLrick	Ferris
Avis	Butler	Dent	FitzHenry
Baker	Campbell	Dershem	Floyd, Ark.
Bartholdt	Church	Dillon	Fordney
Barton	Clark, Fla.	Drukker	Francis
Beakes	Cline	Dupré	French
Bell, Cal.	Conry	Edmonds	Gilmore
Britten	Cramton	Esch	Godwin, N. C.

Good	Kettner	Nolan, J. I.	Steenerson
Goodwin, Ark.	Kindel	Norton	Stephens, Cal.
Graham, Ill.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Oldfield	Stevens, Minn.
Greene, Mass.	Kirkpatrick	Patton, Pa.	Stone
Greene, Vt.	Konop	Peters, Me.	Stout
Haugen	Korbly	Plumley	Taggart
Hawley	Kreider	Rainey	Talbot, Md.
Hedin	La Follette	Raker	Talcott, N. Y.
Helgesen	Lee, Pa.	Reilly, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Howell	Lewis, Md.	Roberts, Nev.	Ten Eyck
Humphrey, Wash.	Lindbergh	Rogers	Towner
Johnson, Utah	McAndrews	Scott	Treadway
Johnson, Wash.	MacDonald	Sharp	Underhill
Kahn	Mapes	Sinnott	Vare
Keating	Mondell	Sloan	Volstead
Kelley, Mich.	Moore	Smith, Idaho	Watkins
Kelly, Pa.	Morgan, Okla.	Smith, Minn.	Wingo
Kennedy, Iowa	Mulkey	Smith, N. Y.	Woodruff
Kent	Murdock	Smith, Saml. W.	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—109.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Hill	Russell
Adamson	Difenderfer	Holland	Seldomridge
Aiken	Dixon	Hull	Shackleford
Alexander	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sherley
Anderson	Doolittle	Lee, Ga.	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lenroot	Sims
Bailey	Doughton	Lieb	Sisson
Baltz	Driscoll	Lloyd	Small
Barkley	Falson	Loneragan	Sparkman
Barnhart	Fergusson	Maguire, Nebr.	Stedman
Bathrick	Fitzgerald	Mann	Stevens, Miss.
Blackmon	Flood, Va.	Montague	Stevens, N. H.
Booher	Foster	Moon	Tavener
Borchers	Fowler	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Moss, Ind.	Thacher
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tex.	Neely, W. Va.	Townsend
Burgess	Gillett	Oglesby	Tribble
Burnett	Goeke	Page, N. C.	Tuttle
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray	Palmer	Underwood
Byrns, Tenn.	Green, Iowa	Park	Watson
Carr	Gregg	Payne	Webb
Claypool	Hamlin	Peterson	Whaley
Collier	Hardy	Quin	Williams
Connelly, Kans.	Harris	Ragsdale	Wilson, Fla.
Cox	Harrison	Reed	Witherspoon
Cullop	Helm	Rouse	
Danforth	Helvering	Rube	
Decker	Hensley	Rucker	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Gard	Hay	Madden	Slemp
Garner	McCoy		

NOT VOTING—206.

Adair	Edwards	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt
Ainey	Elder	Key, Ohio	Porter
Anthony	Estopinal	Kless, Pa.	Post
Aswell	Evans	Kinkaid, N. J.	Pou
Austin	Fairchild	Kitchin	Powers
Barchfeld	Farr	Knowland, J. R.	Prouty
Bartlett	Fess	Lafferty	Rauch
Beall, Tex.	Fields	Langham	Rayburn
Bell, Ga.	Finley	Langley	Reilly, Conn.
Borland	Frear	Lazaro	Riordan
Bowdle	Gallagher	L'Engle	Roberts, Mass.
Brockson	Gallivan	Leshner	Rothermel
Brodbeck	Gardner	Lever	Rupley
Brown, N. Y.	George	Levy	Sabath
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Browne, Wis.	Gill	Lindquist	Scully
Browning	Gittins	Linthicum	Sells
Buckner	Glass	Lobeck	Shreve
Buchanan, Ill.	Goldfogle	Loft	Slayden
Bulkley	Gordon	Logue	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	McClellan	Smith, Md.
Burke, S. Dak.	Goulden	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Stafford
Caldier	Griest	McKellar	Stanley
Callaway	Griffin	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler, Miss.	Gudger	McLaughlin	Stephens, Tex.
Cantor	Guernsey	Mahan	Stringer
Cantrill	Hamill	Maher	Summers
Caraway	Hamilton, Mich.	Manahan	Sutherland
Carew	Hamilton, N. Y.	Martin	Switzer
Carlin	Hammond	Merritt	Taylor, Ala.
Carter	Hardwick	Metz	Taylor, N. Y.
Cary	Hart	Miller	Temple
Casey	Hayden	Mitchell	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Morgan, La.	Thompson, Okla.
Clancy	Henry	Morin	Thompson, Ill.
Coady	Hinds	Moss, W. Va.	Vaughan
Connolly, Iowa	Hinebaugh	Mott	Vollmer
Cooper	Hobson	Murray, Mass.	Walker
Copley	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Wallin
Covington	Howard	Neeley, Kans.	Walsh
Crisp	Hoxworth	Nelson	Walters
Crosser	Hughes, Ga.	O'Brien	Weaver
Dale	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Hair	Whitacre
Davenport	Hulings	O'Leary	White
Davis	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Willis
Dies	Igoe	Padgett	Wilson, N. Y.
Donohoe	Jacoway	Palce, Mass.	Winslow
Dooling	Johnson, S. C.	Parker	Woods
Dunn	Jones	Patten, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Eagan	Keister	Peters, Mass.	
Eagle	Kennedy, Conn.	Phelan	

So the motion to recede and concur was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. CARTER (for) with Mr. McCoy (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. GARNER with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. HAY with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. COADY with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. HATES.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. FARR.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to order a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks a recapitulation of the vote. On as close a vote as this it ought to be had. The Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The Clerk recapitulated the vote.

Mr. LOGUE. Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to be noted as present? I was not here during the call.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can count the gentleman as present to make a quorum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to laying the motion on the table.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's withdrawing the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to reconsider and lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York demand a division of the question. The question is, first, on the motion of the gentleman from California to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment 145 was agreed to.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. SHERLEY) there were—ayes 66, noes 83.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 95, nays 110, answered "present" 6, not voting 222, as follows:

YEAS—95.

Abercrombie	Decker	Helm	Russell
Adamson	Dickinson	Helvering	Seldomridge
Aiken	Difenderfer	Hensley	Shackleford
Alexander	Dixon	Hull	Sherley
Ansberry	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Sims
Bailey	Doughton	Lieb	Sisson
Baltz	Driscoll	Lloyd	Sparkman
Barkley	Falson	Loneragan	Stedman
Barnhart	Fergusson	Maguire, Nebr.	Stevens, Miss.
Blackmon	Fitzgerald	Moon	Stevens, N. H.
Booher	Flood, Va.	Morrison	Tavener
Borchers	Foster	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Brumbaugh	Fowler	Oglesby	Thacher
Buchanan, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Palmer	Townsend
Burnett	Gillett	Park	Tribble
Byrnes, S. C.	Goeke	Peters, Mass.	Tuttle
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Ill.	Peterson	Walsh
Claypool	Gray	Quin	Watson
Collier	Green, Iowa	Ragsdale	Webb
Connelly, Kans.	Gregg	Reed	Whaley
Conry	Hamlin	Reilly, Wis.	Williams
Cox	Hardy	Rube	Witherspoon
Cullop	Harris	Rucker	

NAYS—110.

Allen	Dershem	Hedin	Lindbergh
Anderson	Dillon	Helgesen	Logue
Avis	Drukker	Howell	MacDonald
Baker	Edmonds	Humphrey, Wash.	Mapes
Barchfeld	Esch	Johnson, Utah	Mondell
Bartholdt	Falconer	Kahn	Moore
Barton	Ferris	Keating	Morgan, Okla.
Beakes	FitzHenry	Kelley, Mich.	Mulkey
Bell, Cal.	Foyd, Ark.	Kelly, Pa.	Murdock
Britten	Fordney	Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan, J. I.
Broussard	Francis	Kent	Oldfield
Bryan	French	Kettner	Peters, Me.
Burke, Wis.	Gard	Kindel	Phelan
Butler	Gilmore	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Platt
Campbell	Gittins	Kirkpatrick	Plumley
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	Korbly	Rainey
Church	Good	Kreider	Raker
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Cramton	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Pa.	Rogers
Davis	Greene, Vt.	Lenroot	Rothermel
Dent	Hawley	Lewis, Md.	Scott

Sharp	Smith, Saml. W.	Talcott, N. Y.	Volstead
Sinnot	Steenerson	Taylor, Ark.	Watkins
Sloan	Stephens, Cal.	Ten Eyck	Wingo
Small	Stevens, Minn.	Towner	Woodruff
Smith, Idaho	Stone	Treadway	Young, N. Dak.
Smith, Minn.	Taggart	Underhill	
Smith, N. Y.	Talbot, Md.	Vare	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Garner	Madden	Slomp	Underwood
McCoy	Nelson		

NOT VOTING—222.

Adair	Eagle	Jones	Parker
Ainey	Edwards	Kelster	Pattee, N. Y.
Anthony	Elder	Kennedy, Conn.	Patton, Pa.
Aswell	Estopinal	Kennedy, R. I.	Payne
Austin	Evaus	Kless, Pa.	Porter
Bartlett	Fairchild	Kinhead, N. J.	Post
Bathrick	Farr	Kitchin	Pou
Beall, Tex.	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Powers
Bell, Ga.	Fields	Konop	Prouty
Borland	Finley	Lafferty	Rauch
Bowdle	Frear	Langham	Rayburn
Brockson	Gallagher	Langley	Reilly, Conn.
Brodbeck	Gallivan	Lazarro	Riordan
Brown, N. Y.	Gardner	Lee, Ga.	Roberts, Mass.
Brown, W. Va.	Garrett, Tex.	L'Engle	Rouse
Browne, Wis.	George	Leshner	Rupley
Browning	Gerry	Lever	Sabath
Bruckner	Gill	Levy	Saunders
Buchanan, Ill.	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Scully
Bulkley	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Sells
Burgess	Gordon	Linthicum	Shreve
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	Lobeck	Slayden
Burke, S. Dak.	Goulden	Loft	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Graham, Pa.	McAndrews	Sm th, Md.
Callaway	Griest	McClellan	Smith, Tex.
Candler, Miss.	Giffin	McGillendy	Stafford
Cantor	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Stanley
Cantrill	Guernsey	McKellar	Stephens, Nebr.
Carew	Hamill	McKenzie	Stephens, Tex.
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Stout
Carr	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mahan	Stringer
Carter	Hammond	Mahe	Summers
Cary	Hardwick	Manahan	Sutherland
Casoy	Harrison	Mann	Switzer
Chandler, N. Y.	Hart	Martin	Taylor, Ala.
Clancy	Haugen	Merritt	Taylor, N. Y.
Cline	Hay	Metz	Temple
Coady	Hayden	Miller	Thomas
Connolly, Iowa	Hayes	Mitchell	Thompson, Okla.
Cooper	Henry	Montague	Thomson, Ill.
Copley	Hill	Morgan, La.	Vaughan
Covington	Hinds	Morin	Volmer
Crisp	Hinebaugh	Moss, W. Va.	Walker
Crosser	Hobson	Mott	Wallin
Curry	Holland	Murray, Mass.	Walters
Dale	Houston	Murray, Okla.	Weaver
Danforth	Howard	Neely, Kans.	Whitacre
Davenport	Hoxworth	Neely, W. Va.	White
Detrick	Hughes, Ga.	Norton	Willis
Dies	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Wilson, Fla.
Donohoe	Hulings	O'Hair	Wilson, N. Y.
Dooling	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Leary	Winslow
Doremus	Izoe	O'Shaunessy	Woods
Dunn	Jacoway	Padgett	Young, Tex.
Dunré	Johnson, S. C.	Page, N. C.	
Eagan	Johnson, Wash.	Paige, Mass.	

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCoy (for) with Mr. Carter (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Candler of Mississippi with Mr. Griest.

Mr. Lee of Georgia with Mr. Danforth.

Mr. Page of North Carolina with Mr. Payne.

Mr. Goulden with Mr. Johnson of Washington.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Norton.

Mr. Reilly of Connecticut with Mr. Patton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McClellan with Mr. Morin.

For the session:

Mr. Underwood with Mr. Mann.

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, voted?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Speaker, I have a standing pair with the gentleman from Illinois and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. Underwood was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. McCoy. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Carter. I voted "aye" and I desire to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. McCoy was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. Humphrey of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Humphrey of Washington. I thought there was a rule about Members standing around the desk.

The SPEAKER. That is in reference to the Clerk's desk, not the Speaker's desk. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have not voted, but I presume I can be counted for a quorum.

Mr. KAHN. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. NELSON, of Wisconsin, can be counted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair noted him as present; that is, the Chair will announce his name to the Clerk in a minute or so. Are there any other Members present who did not answer at all on this roll call? If so, the Chair would like to know who they are so that they may be counted. The Clerk will note Mr. NELSON, of Wisconsin, as present, and the Chair is rather inclined to the opinion, not dead sure about it, because the language is rather obscure, notwithstanding what the Chair said here a few days ago, that when a Member is counted as present that he has a right to vote. It is not very clear and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] gave in his adherence to it, but it is a hazy kind of a performance.

Mr. Butler. The Chair ruled against me the other day; the Chair would not let me vote the other day.

The SPEAKER. If you read one section of the rule alone, the gentleman had no right to vote; but if you take two entirely different sections of the rule and put them together it looks like the intention was, when you come to the justice of the matter of counting a Member present, that he has the right to vote.

Mr. Garner. In the very nature of things, if he can be counted present he ought to have the right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make that ruling, and the Clerk will call the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not entitled to vote.

The SPEAKER. Why?

Mr. Fitzgerald. Because the rule provides that no one shall vote unless he was present in the House giving attention when his name is called or should have been called. The question of whether a quorum is present has not been developed, and it is only upon a call of the House where the doors are closed and the Sergeant at Arms is directed to bring in the absentees that a gentleman can vote before the roll is closed whether or not he was here at the time his name was called. Under the proposed other ruling it makes it possible for a Member to come in and vote at any time.

The SPEAKER. Well, inasmuch as it makes no difference, the Chair will let the question stand open. However, the Chair with his present information would allow him to vote.

Mr. Fitzgerald. The rule authorizes the Speaker to have noted as present gentlemen who have not voted, but it does not give him any authority to permit a Member to vote who did not vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York, for whose parliamentary opinion he has great respect, to two different sections of Rule XV, section 1 of which is as follows:

Upon every roll call the names of the Members shall be called alphabetically by surname, except when two or more have the same surname, in which case the name of the State shall be added; and if there be two such Members from the same State, the whole name shall be called, and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

Now, that is proposition number one. Here is clause 3.

On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

Now, taking those two sections together, it does not mean that the Speaker counts a gentleman present who did not vote.

Mr. Shackelford. But, Mr. Speaker, has the point of no quorum been raised?

The SPEAKER. There is a time when the Speaker has to raise it himself. Whenever the roll call develops the fact that there is no quorum the Speaker must take notice of it, if that is the proper term. What does the gentleman from New York say to those two sections?

Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Speaker, in all the history of the House since the adoption of the rules referred to I have never known of an instance, either in the precedents or in the practice of the House, where a Member under these circumstances has been permitted to have his vote recorded.

The SPEAKER. Well, how the Chair came to dig into this matter was, after the interlocutory performance which he had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Butler] here a

few days ago, one of the old and experienced Members of the House, who devotes a great deal of attention to parliamentary law, came to the Speaker privately and called his attention to these two sections taken in conjunction:

On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

Now, turn back to section 1, and it says:

And thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

The Chair stated that the matter was not very clear, that it was somewhat hazy; but it seems if you take those two sections together—and especially section 1 points out section 3—that a Member that is noted by the Speaker or the Clerk, or somebody for him, as being present has a right to vote.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the Speaker hear me for just a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear any gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to be heard just as to the suggestion as to the effect of a rule that a Member coming in after the close of a roll call and being noted as present by the Speaker may vote. Outside of the question of the rule—and the rule does not seem to be entirely clear, although the practice has been entirely uniform—but outside of the rule the effect of a decision of that kind would be that it would not be necessary for Members to come in during the roll call. They could saunter in at their leisure and get in at any time before the announcement of the vote.

The SPEAKER. It is only in a case where a quorum has not developed.

Mr. MONDELL. I am assuming the somewhat chronic condition that sometimes exists, and exists now, where we are right on the margin of a quorum all the time. There is scarcely ever a quorum in the House at the beginning of a roll call or in the House at any one time. The quorum comes in and goes out; but if under those circumstances Members were not required to be here when their names were called they could come in at any time before the vote was announced and could be recognized by the Speaker and vote. It seems to me it would lead to interminable delay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. In a minute. Inasmuch as counting the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] would not make a quorum, anyway, the Chair feels like leaving the matter open until we can have a general consultation as to what the rule means, because it is extremely hazy and extremely important, too, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KAHN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] demands a division. Those in favor of the House adjourning will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Seventy-six gentlemen have risen in the affirmative.

The Chair thinks, after consulting the Manual, that the motion to adjourn as made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] at the particular time at which it was made was out of order—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER (continuing). Until after the announcement of the result of that vote. And there is not a quorum present. The yeas were 95, the nays 110, present 5, and I noted—not a quorum.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It does not take—

Mr. KAHN. I move a call of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I had moved that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] had moved to adjourn. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAPES. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. The roll call having revealed that there is not a quorum present, does it take a majority of those present to

second the motion to adjourn before the Speaker can entertain it?

The SPEAKER. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is only after the call of the House.

The SPEAKER. Only on the call of the House. Of course the motion to adjourn takes precedence. The only trouble about it was that when it was first made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] it was out of order. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY and Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—yeas 87, nays 79.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 100, answered "present" 5, not voting 224, as follows:

YEAS—104.

Abercrombie	Callip	Hardy	Rucker
Adamson	Decker	Harris	Russell
Aiken	Dent	Helm	Seldoubridge
Alexander	Dickinson	Helvering	Shackelford
Allen	Diffenderfer	Hensley	Sherley
Ansherry	Dixon	Hull	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Sims
Bailey	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Sisson
Baltz	Doremus	Korbly	Small
Barkley	Doughton	Lieb	Sparkman
Barnhart	Dunne	Lloyd	Stedman
Blackmon	Falcon	Louevan	Stephens, Miss.
Booth	Ferguson	Magnire, Nebr.	Stevens, N. H.
Borchers	Ferris	Moon	Tavener
Brumbaugh	Fitzgerald	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Buchanan, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Moss, Ind.	Thacher
Burgess	Foster	Mulkey	Townsend
Burnett	Fowler	Oglesby	Tribble
Byrnes, S. C.	Garner	Palmer	Tuttle
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	Park	Underhill
Claypool	Gilmore	Peterson	Walsh
Cline	Goeke	Quin	Watkins
Collier	Graham, Ill.	Ragsdale	Watson
Connelly, Kans.	Gray	Reed	Whaley
Coary	Gregg	Reilly, Wis.	Williams
Cox	Hamlin	Ituby	Witherspoon

NAYS—100.

Anderson	Fordney	Kettner	Raker
Avis	Francis	Kindel	Roberts, Nev.
Baker	French	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rogers
Barchfeld	Gard	Kirkpatrick	Rothermel
Barton	Gillett	Kreider	Rosse
Beakes	Gittins	La Follette	Scott
Bell, Cal.	Goodwin, N. C.	Lee, Pa.	Sharp
Blythen	Good	Lenroot	Sinnot
Brennard	Goodwin, Ark.	Lindbergh	Sloan
Bryan	Green, Iowa	Locue	Smith, Idaho
Bryce, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	McKellar	Smith, Minn.
Butler	Greene, Vt.	MacDonald	Steenerson
Campbell	Hawley	Mapes	Stephens, Cal.
Caraway	Hayden	Monnell	Stevens, Minn.
Church	Hefflin	Moore	Stone
Clark, Fla.	Helgesen	Morgan, Okla.	Taegart
Cramton	Howell	Murdock	Talcott, N. Y.
Davis	Humphrey, Wash.	Nelson	Taylor, Ark.
Diershem	Johnson, Utah.	Nolan, J. I.	Towner
Dillon	Kahn	O'Hair	Treadway
Drukker	Keating	Oldfield	Vare
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Peters, Me.	Volstead
Esch	Kelly, Pa.	Phelan	Wingo
Falconer	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley	Woodruff
FitzGentry	Kent	Raney	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Burke, S. Dak.	Madden	McCoy	Underwood
Carter			

NOT VOTING—224.

Adair	Carlin	Evans	Hammond
Alney	Carr	Fairchild	Hardwick
Anthony	Cary	Farr	Harrison
Aswell	Casey	Fess	Hart
Austin	Chandler, N. Y.	Fields	Haugen
Bartlett	Clancy	Finley	Hay
Bartlett	Coady	Floyd, Ark.	Hayes
Bathrick	Connolly, Iowa	Frear	Henry
Beall, Tex.	Cooper	Gallagher	Hill
Bell, Ga.	Copley	Gallivan	Hinds
Borland	Covington	Gardner	Hinebaugh
Bowdle	Crisp	Garrett, Tex.	Hobson
Brockson	Crosser	George	Holland
Brodbeck	Curry	Gerry	Houston
Brown, N. Y.	Dale	Gill	Howard
Brown, W. Va.	Danforth	Glass	Hoxworth
Browne, Wis.	Davenport	Goldfogle	Hughes, Ga.
Browning	Deitrick	Gordon	Hughes, W. Va.
Bruckner	Dies	Gorman	Hulings
Buchanan, Ill.	Donohoe	Goulden	Humphreys, Miss.
Bulley	Dooling	Graham, Pa.	Igoe
Burke, Pa.	Driscoll	Griest	Jacaway
Calder	Dunn	Griffin	Johnson, S. C.
Callaway	Eagan	Gudger	Johnson, Wash.
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Guernsey	Jones
Cantor	Edwards	Hamill	Kelster
Cantrill	Elder	Hamilton, Mich.	Kennedy, Conn.
Carew	Estopinal	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kennedy, R. I.

Kless, Pa.	Manahan	Platt	Stout
Kinkaid, N. J.	Mann	Porter	Stringer
Kitchin	Martin	Post	Summers
Knowland, J. R.	Merritt	Pou	Sutherland
Konop	Metz	Powers	Switzer
Lafferty	Miller	Prouty	Talbot, Md.
Langham	Mitchell	Rauch	Taylor, Ala.
Langley	Montague	Rayburn	Taylor, N. Y.
Lazaro	Morgan, La.	Reilly, Conn.	Temple
Lee, Ga.	Morin	Riordan	Ten Eyck
L'Engle	Moss, W. Va.	Roberts, Mass.	Thomas
Lesher	Mott	Rupley	Thompson, Okla.
Lever	Murray, Mass.	Sabath	Thomson, Ill.
Levy	Murray, Okla.	Saunders	Vaughan
Lewis, Md.	Neeley, Kans.	Scully	Vollmer
Lewis, Pa.	Neely, W. Va.	Sells	Walker
Lindquist	Norton	Shreve	Wallin
Linthicum	O'Brien	Slayden	Walters
Lobeck	O'Leary	Slomp	Weaver
Loft	O'Shaunessy	Smith, J. M. C.	Webb
McAndrews	Padgett	Smith, Md.	Whitacre
McClellan	Page, N. C.	Smith, N. Y.	White
McGillendy	Paige, Mass.	Smith, Saml. W.	Willis
McGuire, Okla.	Parker	Smith, Tex.	Wilson, Fla.
McKenzie	Patten, N. Y.	Stafford	Wilson, N. Y.
McLaughlin	Patton, Pa.	Stanley	Winslow
Mahan	Payne	Stephens, Nebr.	Woods
Maher	Peters, Mass.	Stephens, Tex.	Young, Tex.

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCoy (for) with Mr. CARTER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. TREADWAY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "present." I desire to change my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

Mr. MCCOY. I withdraw my vote of "present" and vote "yea."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. If the House now moves to adjourn, will this come up as unfinished business to-morrow morning, or would it come up Thursday morning, to-morrow being Calendar Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that it would go over until Thursday. The previous question was ordered on this, was it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I find that Mr. CARTER, of Oklahoma, with whom I was paired, voted "present" on the supposition that I was not here, so that I will have to change my vote again and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. McCoy, and he answered "Present."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KAHN. This matter coming up on a conference report, would not the conference report have priority on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the language of the Calendar Wednesday rule is that "immediately upon the approval of the Journal" the Speaker shall cause the roll of the committees to be called, and so forth. I am not sure; I may be mistaken in my memory of the exact wording of that language, but I think it is "immediately upon the approval of the Journal." If I am correct as to that language, of course this could not come up to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Here is what the rule on Calendar Wednesday says:

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule, unless the House, by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to reconsider no previous question was demanded or ordered, so that it does not come within the category, although a motion of very high privilege. Of course, if this motion to reconsider is to be disposed of to-morrow it brings the entire matter before the House, and there is another amendment still to be disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled on two or three different occasions, and the action of the gentleman from New York has borne out the ruling of the Chair, that even a conference report could not be considered on Calendar Wednesday except by unanimous consent. The gentleman from New York has asked unanimous consent on several occasions on Calendar Wednesday to set aside that day. Now, this is a part of a conference report. The present Speaker ruled that no bill could be taken up for consideration on Calendar Wednesday without

a motion to dispense with that day. The Chair thinks, under all the circumstances and rulings on the subject of Calendar Wednesday, the previous question not having been ordered on the motion to reconsider, that it goes over until Thursday. The Chair is desirous, as are the Members of the House, of observing the integrity of Calendar Wednesday so far as it is consistent with common sense.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Stamford Harbor, Conn., with a view to securing increased depth and removal of obstructions to navigation (H. Doc. No. 1130); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusion in case of James Crabtree, heir at law of Eli Crabtree, deceased, and executor of Sarah Crabtree, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1131); to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOEKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17894) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 995), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) granting permission to the Army and Navy athletic associations to use the polo field in Potomac Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 996), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 754) for the relief of Jacob M. Cooper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 998), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5065) for the relief of Mirick Burgess, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 999), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1063) for the relief of Philip Cook, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1000), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYPOOL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5168) for the relief of the Kling Theological Hall, and authorizing the conveyance of real estate to the Howard University and other grantees, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1001), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17919) for the relief of W. A. M. Streeter, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 17999) to provide for the establishment of an additional life-saving station at Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 18000) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Pittsfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18001) providing for the extension of the post office at Galesburg, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 18002) to provide for the making of farm loans from the postal savings funds; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: A resolution (H. Res. 574) requesting the President to transmit to the House a copy of Prof. Ford's report; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 18003) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 18004) granting a pension to Susan J. McDermitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 18005) granting a pension to Louis Naegle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 18006) for the relief of Frank Woodruff Kellogg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 18007) granting a pension to Walter C. Lettie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 18008) for the relief of the Missionary Baptist Church of Toone, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 18009) granting an increase of pension to Cecilia McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A resolution (H. Res. 575) referring to the Court of Claims certain claims under section 151 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of E. P. Wheeler, New York, against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Civil Service Reform League, relative to H. R. 17042, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters relative to House bill 17042, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Department Veterans, Army of the Philippines, relative to civil-service conditions in Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of 23 citizens of Rouse, Pa., favoring the passage of Sheppard-Hobson bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of Lockeford (Cal.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Woman's Council, Stockton, Cal., favoring censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petitions of 7 citizens and residents of the third California district protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by mass meeting of citizens of Lodi, Cal., signed by C. E. Durston, chairman, and John H. Williams, secretary, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of 7 citizens and residents of the third California district, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the First Baptist Church of Woodland, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions by 177 citizens of the State of California, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Napa, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by R. W. Munson, acting chaplain, St. Helena Sanitarium, Sanitarium, Cal., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by the Musician's Protective Union, of Sacramento, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition by Lockeford (Cal.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin Retail Jewelers' Association, of Neenah, Wis., favoring passage of the Owen-Goeke bill, relative to fraud in gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERGUSON: Petitions of the L. N. T. Club, by Mrs. C. B. Cannell, presiding officer, and Mrs. George Resley, secretary; the Pinon Baptist Church, by Rev. Y. F. Barnett, pastor, and Mrs. Mattie Rogers, secretary; the Pinon Baptist Sunday School, by T. F. Fleming, presiding officer, and Miss Linnie Resley, secretary; and 53 citizens, all of Pinon, N. Mex., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of James F. Donovan, Edward Flynn, Thomas Padley, F. Nichols, Andrew Link, James Rooney, Vincent Castronovo, Augustus Angelo, Jeremiah D. Dailey, J. H. Carroll, Herman Duher, Lawrence A. McGrane, R. Williams, George W. Stage, J. Hansom, William Dexter, Henry Sweet, Michael H. McElroy, Walter A. Neuhon, Thomas L. Dowling, Philip Montell, J. N. Whelden, W. J. Murphy, R. J. Walsh, John Burns, J. H. Domling, John McDonnell, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Everett E. Gardiner, Ralph J. Regniere, M. Hathaway, of Cranston, R. I.; John J. Quirk, of Warwick, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the executive committee of the Retail Merchants' Bureau of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, protesting against the passage of the Stevens standard price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of D. E. Weld and other residents of the first congressional district of Vermont, urging a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of sundry citizens of Rockingham County, Va., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of Council of Hamilton, Ill., favoring increased bridge facilities across the Mississippi River between Keokuk, Iowa, and Hamilton, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and V. D. Michener, of Salem, Iowa, and 7 citizens of Lee County, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition by the members of the Germania Quartette Club, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of the Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Fred N. Rounds, J. G. Goodison, M. C. Mason, W. E. Whitford, M. W. Rounds, Fred D. Ricket, Roy Badger, H. Thomlin, R. Dow, J. J. Walker, Charles Witherell, Allen M. Gaslon, Gus Stratton, B. J. Mason, F. L. Rounds, J. S. Orr, B. W. Thornton, Arthur W. Young, Rev. Joseph Lobb, all of DePyster, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Herman A. James, E. S. Horton, W. A. Poyes, Duncan Paul, C. A. McAfee, S. C. Blauvelt, Seymour Williams, T. E. Lattull, W. MacDowell, J. H. Hallock, W. J. Oakey, R. Johnston, R. Amons, W. L. Richardson, T. H. Peycock, H. I. Baldwin, George Ray Schrader, E. L. Pearce, E. F. Schrader, W. S. Ames, O. W. Parker, W. J. Richardson, James B. Cameron, C. W. Park, A. E. Fraleigh, George B. Greenough, William G. Distin, William L. Distin, E. C. Horton, William M. Tilbee, Hugh M. King, N. A. Jennings, Elza H. Greene, G. W. Abbott, and James Rainey, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, letter from Rev. A. G. Sunderland, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church of Chazy, N. Y., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Rev. Willis R. Ryder, pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church of Ellenburg, N. Y., in behalf of the societies of said church, urging the passage of the Sheppard-Hobson resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia; Central Tube Co., James H. Matthews Co., George H. Alexander & Co., Monongahela Tube Co., Chamber of Commerce, Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh Meter Co., Union Electric Co., B. B. & B. Trunk Co., Germania Savings Bank, George A. Kelly Co., the Pittsburgh Dry Goods Co., Pittsburgh Hardwood Door Co., Alexander Laughlin & Co., John Daub & Sons, Thomas C. Jenkins, F. J. Kress, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against sections 7 and 18 of the Clayton antitrust bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring electric protection of vaults and safes in Government offices and buildings; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against House bill 13457, relative to United States surveys; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also (by request), petition of sundry citizens of the National Civil Service Reform League, protesting against section 3 of House bill 17042; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the Newlands amendment to the river and harbor bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of the Harrison bill, to regulate sale of poisons, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against extension of parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against House bill 17139 and Senate bill 5664, relative to use of mails by insurance companies to procure fire-insurance policies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 11178; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the California State Rural Letter Carriers' Association against section 4 of the Moon bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'HAIR: Petition of Post No. 257, Greenup, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring abolition of office of pension examiners; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Post Office Clerks' Association of California; Branch No. 290 of the National Association of Letter Carriers of the Santa Barbara Post Office; Branch No. 726, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of Santa Barbara; and California State Rural Letter Carriers' Association, protesting against section 4 of the Moon bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Papers to accompany a bill granting pension to Cecilia McCullough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Tampa, Fla., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of 26 citizens of Bradentown, Fla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of Harbor City Post, Grand Army of the Republic, and Harbor City Woman's Relief Corps, at San Pedro, Cal., protesting against any change in the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.